arXiv:1611.01369v1 [math.ST] 4 Nov 2016

Asymptotic Theory of a Non-Marginal Multiple Testing Procedure and Comparison With Existing Methods

Noirrit K. Chandra and Sourabh Bhattacharya*

Abstract

Recently, Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016) proposed a novel and general Bayesian multiple comparison method such that the decision on any hypothesis depends upon the joint posterior probability of the hypotheses on which the current hypothesis is strongly dependent. Here we investigate the asymptotic properties of their methodology, establishing in particular rates of convergence to zero of several versions of Bayesian false discovery rate and Bayesian false non-discovery rate associated with the non-marginal approach, as the sample size tends to infinity.

We also establish convergence properties of several other established multiple testing methods, each representing a class of methodologies, and show that the non-marginal method is as good as the existing ones in that the associated versions of Bayesian false non-discovery rate converge to zero at the same rate, compared to the other methods, when versions of Bayesian false discovery rate are asymptotically controlled.

Moreover, we also propose a novel method to retrospectively compare the decision configurations obtained by the non-marginal method and the other methods in small samples, by conceptually extending the available finite sample to a sufficiently large sample. In this regard, we show that the decision configuration obtained from the non-marginal method minimizes the Kullback-Leibler divergence from the true decision configuration, and hence, is optimal in this sense, compared to all existing methods. In fact, we are able to prove that the non-marginal method retrospectively yields the Bayes oracle with respect to a loss function based on the Kullback-Leibler divergence measure.

Keywords: *Bayesian false discovery rate; Bayesian false non-discovery rate; Bayes oracle; Kullback-Leibler divergence; Multiple testing under dependence; Posterior consistency.*

1 Introduction

Letting $\boldsymbol{X}_n = \{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ denote the available data set and for $M > 1$, denoting by $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = \Theta_1 \times \cdots \times \Theta_M$ the relevant parameter space associated with the relevant parametric or nonparametric model, let us consider the problem of testing m hypotheses simultaneously, where $1 < m \leq M$; we allow M to be infinity as well. Without loss of generality, let us consider testing the parameters associated with Θ_i; $i = 1, \ldots, m$, formalized as:

$$H_{0i} : \theta_i \in \Theta_{0i} \text{ versus } H_{1i} : \theta_i \in \Theta_{1i},$$

where $\Theta_{0i} \bigcap \Theta_{1i} = \emptyset$ and $\Theta_{0i} \bigcup \Theta_{1i} = \Theta_i,$ for $i = 1, \cdots, m$. Let

$$r_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } H_{1i} \text{ is true;} \\ 0 & \text{if } H_{0i} \text{ is true,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$d_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } H_{1i} \text{ is accepted;} \\ 0 & \text{if } H_{0i} \text{ is accepted.} \end{cases}$$

Following Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016) let us define G_i to be the set of hypotheses, including the i-th one, that are closely related.

$$z_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } H_{d_j,j} \text{ is true for all } j \in G_i \setminus \{i\}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

*Noirrit K. Chandra is a PhD student and Sourabh Bhattacharya is an Associate Professor in Interdisciplinary Statistical Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203, B. T. Road, Kolkata 700108. Corresponding e-mail: sourabh@isical.ac.in.

If, for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, $G_i = \{i\}$, a singleton, then we define $z_i = 1$. Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016) maximize the posterior expectation of the number of true positives

$$TP = \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i r_i z_i, \tag{1.2}$$

subject to controlling the posterior expectation of the error term

$$E = \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i (1 - r_i z_i), \tag{1.3}$$

which is actually the posterior mean of the sum of three error terms $E_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i (1 - r_i) z_i$, $E_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i (1 - r_i)(1 - z_i)$ and $E_3 = \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i r_i (1 - z_i)$. For detailed discussion regarding these, see Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016).

It follows that the decision configuration can be obtained by minimizing the function

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi(\boldsymbol{d}) &= -\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i E[r_i z_i | \boldsymbol{X}_n] + \lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i E\left[(1 - r_i z_i) | \boldsymbol{X}_n\right] \\
&= -(1 + \lambda_n) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \frac{\lambda_n}{1 + \lambda_n} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

with respect to all possible decision configurations of the form $\boldsymbol{d} = \{d_1, \ldots, d_m\}$, where $\lambda_n > 0$, and

$$w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) = E[r_i z_i | \boldsymbol{X}_n] = \pi\left(H_{1i} \cap \left\{\cap_{j \neq i, j \in G_i} H_{d_j, j}\right\} | \boldsymbol{X}_n\right), \tag{1.4}$$

is the posterior probability of the decision configuration $\{d_1, \ldots, d_{i-1}, 1, d_{i+1}, \ldots, d_m\}$ being correct. Letting $\beta_n = \lambda_n / (1 + \lambda_n)$, one can equivalently maximize

$$\xi(\boldsymbol{d}) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n \right) \tag{1.5}$$

with respect to $\boldsymbol{d}$.

1.1 Bayesian versions of false discovery and false non-discovery rates

Following Sarkar *et al.* (2008), for any given multiple testing method $\mathcal{M}$, we define the Bayesian version of false discovery rate, denoted by Bayesian false discovery rate ($BFDR$) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
BFDR(\mathcal{M}) &= E\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i (1 - r_i)}{\{\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i\} \vee 1} \delta(\boldsymbol{d} | \boldsymbol{X}_n) \right] \\
&= E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}} \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i (1 - v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}))}{\{\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i\} \vee 1} \right) \delta_{\mathcal{M}}(\boldsymbol{d} | \boldsymbol{X}_n) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

where $v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) = \pi(H_{1i} | \boldsymbol{X}_n)$ is the marginal posterior probability of the i-th alternative hypothesis, and

$$\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(\boldsymbol{d} | \boldsymbol{X}_n) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \left\{\delta_i(\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right\}^{d_i} \left\{1 - \delta_i(\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right\}^{1 - d_i};\ \boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}. \tag{1.7}$$

In other words, $\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(\boldsymbol{d} | \boldsymbol{X}_n)$ is the probability of obtaining the decision configuration $\boldsymbol{d}$ given data set $\boldsymbol{X}_n$, after implementing method $\mathcal{M}$. Note that for all non-randomized multiple testing methods, $\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(\boldsymbol{d} | \boldsymbol{X}_n)$ is either 0 or 1.

As in Sarkar *et al.* (2008), we analogously define Bayesian false non-discovery rate ($BFNR$) as

$$BFNR(\mathcal{M}) = E\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i) r_i}{\{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i)\} \vee 1} \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right]$$
$$= E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\neq\boldsymbol{1}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i) v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i)\} \vee 1} \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right]. \tag{1.8}$$

Storey (2003) points out advantages of considering positive versions of false discovery and false non-discovery rates. As such, for any given multiple testing methodology $\mathcal{M}$, we define the positive versions of $BFDR$ and FNR as follows:

$$pBFDR(\mathcal{M}) = E\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i (1-r_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i} \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) \middle| \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}=\boldsymbol{0}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = 0\right]$$
$$= E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\neq\boldsymbol{0}} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right) \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right] \times \frac{1}{P\left(\delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}=\boldsymbol{0}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)=0\right)}, \tag{1.9}$$

$$pBFNR(\mathcal{M}) = E\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i) r_i}{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i)} \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) \middle| \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}=\boldsymbol{1}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = 0\right]$$
$$= E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\neq\boldsymbol{1}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i) v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i)} \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right] \times \frac{1}{P\left(\delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}=\boldsymbol{1}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)=0\right)}. \tag{1.10}$$

In fact, with respect to all the multiple testing methods of our interest, the asymptotic forms of $BFDR$ and $BFNR$ will the same as those of the positive versions $pBFDR$ and $pBFNR$. Hence, for our purpose, we shall refer to only the positive versions unless the situation requires us to refer to and consider $BFDR$ and $BFNR$.

The above definitions make sense when decision rules based on marginal posteriors are considered. For the non-marginal procedure of Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016) we consider modified $pBFDR(\mathcal{M})$ given by

$$mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}) = E\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i (1-r_i z_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i} \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) \middle| \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}=\boldsymbol{0}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = 0\right]$$
$$= E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\neq\boldsymbol{0}} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right) \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right] \times \frac{1}{P\left(\delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}=\boldsymbol{0}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)=0\right)}, \tag{1.11}$$

and modified $pBFNR(\mathcal{M})$ given by

$$mpBFNR(\mathcal{M}) = E\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i) r_i z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i)} \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) \middle| \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}=\boldsymbol{1}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = 0\right]$$
$$= E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\neq\boldsymbol{1}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i) w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i)} \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right] \times \frac{1}{P\left(\delta_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}=\boldsymbol{1}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)=0\right)}. \tag{1.12}$$

In Sections 3 and 4 we investigate the asymptotic properties of the above measures with respect to different multiple testing methods that are consistent in that they yield the correct decision configuration as the sample size n tends to infinity. In particular, in Section 3 we show that for all consistent methods, $mpBFDR$ converge to zero at the same rate; so does $pBFDR$. We also provide sufficient conditions under which the convergence rates are characterized by the Kullback-Leibler (KL)-divergence from the true decision configuration, and show that the $mpBFDR$ rate can not be faster than that of $pBFDR$ but is associated with smaller KL-divergence. We also provide sufficient conditions under which both the rates are characterized by the same KL-divergence. As regards $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$, our investigations that we report in Section 4 show that for consistent multiple testing methods they converge to zero at the same rate.

We next investigate the asymptotic properties of $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$ when the consistent multiple testing methods are adjusted so that $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$ tend to α, for some $\alpha \in (0, a)$, where $a \leq 1$. For our purpose, we first categorize the methods into the following categories: (a) methods based on optimizing appropriate functions associated with penalization, (b) methods based on ordered criteria, such as P-values and (c) step-up/step-down methods. In Sections 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4, we provide a brief description of the main asymptotic results for these categories.

1.2 Briefing of the main asymptotic results associated with category (a)

In the case of (a) we investigate and compare the asymptotic properties of our method, that of Guindani *et al.* (2009), and that of Storey (2007), along with its Bayesian version that we propose. The asymptotic results for all other methods falling in this category follow the same mathematical treatment. We also show that these methods can be adjusted so that the versions of FDR admit asymptotic control at desired $\alpha \in (0, a)$, where $a < 1$. We show that in these cases, the corresponding versions of FNR tend to zero at the same rate. The details are provided in Section 5.

1.3 Brief description of the main asymptotic results associated with category (b)

In this category we consider the methods of Benjamini and Hochberg (1995), Sarkar *et al.* (2008) as representatives; we also propose a randomized version of Benjamini and Hochberg (1995). All other methods in this category admit the same mathematical treatment for asymptotics. We show that the versions of FDR tend to zero at the same rate as $n \to \infty$ if α-control is not exercised; otherwise, they tend to α for properly designed methods. In particular, the procedure of Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) does not attain positive α asymptotically, but our randomized version of the method does.

In this case as well α can not take any value in $(0, 1)$, but in $(0, b)$, and this interval is different from that associated with category (a). In fact, the asymptotically permissible ranges of α for versions of $BFDR$ and $BFNR$ are different for the randomized procedures of this category. The versions of FNR tend to zero at the same rate as $n \to \infty$; moreover, the rate is the same as that of category (a).

Section 6 contains the details of the asymptotic results.

1.4 Brief description of the main asymptotic results associated with category (c)

For category (c) We consider as representative the step-down method of Chen and Sarkar (2004). In this category the asymptotic results, which we present in Section 7, remain the same as those of categories (a) and (b). It is also to be noted that desired α-control for FDR is neither desired, nor possible for methods of this category.

In summary, the asymptotic results with respect to the three categories differ only with respect to the choices of α available.

1.5 Brief discussion on a retrospective method for comparing decision configurations obtained from various multiple testing methods in small samples

Although asymptotic treatment is important for learning about behaviors of complex statistical procedures under large samples, it would be most befitting from a practical perspective if light can be shed upon even small sample properties of statistical procedures using asymptotic theory after conceptually extending the available small sample to a sufficiently large sample. For our purpose, we note that it is of utmost importance to develop methods for comparing decision configurations obtained from various methods, for small samples. Hence, in accordance with the aforementioned philosophy, we propose and develop a novel method that conceptually and retrospectively extends the small sample to a sufficiently large sample, and shows that the non-marginal multiple testing method of Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016) is optimal in the sense that their decision configuration obtained in the small sample case retrospectively minimizes the KL-divergence from the true decision configuration. Furthermore, we establish that the non-marginal procedure is retrospective Bayes oracle, in the sense of retrospectively minimizing the posterior expected loss with respect to a loss function based on the KL-divergence. The complete details are provided in Section 8.

Before we begin our formal asymptotic proceedings, it is worth noting that our results crucially hinge on assumptions related to Bayesian posterior consistency. In this regard, throughout, we assume the technical set-up and conditions that ensure consistency of the posterior distributions proved in Shalizi (2009). In Section 2 we provide the set-up, assumptions and the main result of Shalizi (2009). Remarkably, the result holds under quite general dependence set-up, which is very appropriate in our multiple testing context.

2 Preliminaries for ensuring posterior consistency under general set-up

Following Shalizi (2009) we consider a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$, and a sequence of random variables $X_1, X_2, \ldots$, taking values in some measurable space $(\Xi, \mathcal{X})$, whose infinite-dimensional distribution is P. The natural filtration of this process is $\sigma(\boldsymbol{X}_n)$.

Following Shalizi (2009) we denote the distributions of processes adapted to $\sigma(\boldsymbol{X}_n)$ by F_θ, where θ is associated with a measurable space $(\Theta, \mathcal{T})$, and is generally infinite-dimensional. For the sake of convenience, we assume, as in Shalizi (2009), that P and all the F_θ are dominated by a common reference measure, with respective densities f_0 and f_θ. The usual assumptions that $P \in \Theta$ or even P lies in the support of the prior on Θ, are not required for Shalizi's result, rendering it very general indeed.

2.1 Assumptions and theorem of Shalizi

(S1) Consider the following likelihood ratio:

$$R_n(\theta) = \frac{f_\theta(\boldsymbol{X}_n)}{f_0(\boldsymbol{X}_n)}. \tag{2.1}$$

Assume that $R_n(\theta)$ is $\sigma(\boldsymbol{X}_n) \times \mathcal{T}$-measurable for all $n > 0$.

(S2) For each $\theta \in \Theta$, the generalized or relative asymptotic equipartition property holds, and so, almost surely,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log R_n(\theta) = -h(\theta),$$

where $h(\theta)$ is given in (S3) below.

(S3) For every $\theta \in \Theta$, the KL-divergence rate

$$h(\theta) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} E\left(\log \frac{f_0(\boldsymbol{X}_n)}{f_\theta(\boldsymbol{X}_n)}\right). \tag{2.2}$$

exists (possibly being infinite) and is $\mathcal{T}$-measurable.

(S4) Let $I = \{\theta : h(\theta) = \infty\}$. The prior π satisfies $\pi(I) < 1$.

Following the notation of Shalizi (2009), for $A \subseteq \Theta$, let

$$h(A) = \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\theta \in A} h(\theta); \tag{2.3}$$

$$J(\theta) = h(\theta) - h(\Theta); \tag{2.4}$$

$$J(A) = \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\theta \in A} J(\theta). \tag{2.5}$$

(S5) There exists a sequence of sets $\mathcal{G}_n \to \Theta$ as $n \to \infty$ such that:

(1)
$$\pi(\mathcal{G}_n) \geq 1 - \alpha \exp(-\beta n), \text{ for some } \alpha > 0,\ \beta > 2h(\Theta); \tag{2.6}$$

(2) The convergence in (S3) is uniform in θ over $\mathcal{G}_n \setminus I$.

(3) $h(\mathcal{G}_n) \to h(\Theta)$, as $n \to \infty$.

For each measurable $A \subseteq \Theta$, for every $\delta > 0$, there exists a random natural number $\tau(A, \delta)$ such that

$$n^{-1} \log \int_A R_n(\theta)\pi(\theta)d\theta \leq \delta + \limsup_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log \int_A R_n(\theta)\pi(\theta)d\theta, \tag{2.7}$$

for all $n > \tau(A, \delta)$, provided $\limsup_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log \pi(\mathbb{I}_A R_n) < \infty$. Regarding this, the following assumption has been made by Shalizi:

(S6) The sets $\mathcal{G}_n$ of (S5) can be chosen such that for every $\delta > 0$, the inequality $n > \tau(\mathcal{G}_n, \delta)$ holds almost surely for all sufficiently large n.

(S7) The sets $\mathcal{G}_n$ of (S5) and (S6) can be chosen such that for any set A with $\pi(A) > 0$,

$$h(\mathcal{G}_n \cap A) \to h(A), \tag{2.8}$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Under the above assumptions, the following version of the theorem of Shalizi (2009) can be seen to hold.

Theorem 1 (Shalizi (2009)) *Consider assumptions (S1)–(S7) and any set $A \in \mathcal{T}$ with $\pi(A) > 0$. If $\beta > 2h(A)$, where β is given in (2.6) under assumption (S5), then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \pi(A|\boldsymbol{X}_n) = -J(A), \tag{2.9}$$

where $\pi(\cdot|\boldsymbol{X}_n)$ denotes the posterior distribution of θ given $\boldsymbol{X}_n$.

We shall frequently make use of this theorem for our purpose.

3 Asymptotic analyses of $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$ with respect to consistent multiple testing methods

In this section we investigate the asymptotic properties of $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$ for all multiple testing methods $\mathcal{M}$ that are consistent in the sense that $E\left[\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(\boldsymbol{d}^t|\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right] \to 1$ and $E\left[\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right] \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for $\boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{d}^t$.

Let

$$\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}} = H_{1i} \cap \left\{ \underset{j\neq i,\ j\in G_i}{\cap} H_{d_j,j} \right\};\ \bar{\Theta}_{i\boldsymbol{d}} = H_{0i} \cap \left\{ \underset{j\neq i,\ j\in G_i}{\cap} H_{d_j,j} \right\}$$

and letting $\boldsymbol{d}_G = \{d_j : j \in G\}$, let us define

$$\mathbb{D}_i = \{\boldsymbol{d} :\ \text{all elements of } \boldsymbol{d}_{G_i} \text{ are correct}\}\,.$$

Hence, $\mathbb{D}_i^c = \{\boldsymbol{d} :\ \text{at least one element of } \boldsymbol{d}_{G_i} \text{ is incorrect}\}$. Also, let

$$\bar{\mathbb{D}}_i^c = \{\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}_i^c : \boldsymbol{d}_{G_i} \text{ are distinct}\}\,;\ \bar{\mathbb{D}}_i = \{\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}_i : \boldsymbol{d}_{G_i} \text{ are distinct}\} = \mathbb{D}_i.$$

By Shalizi (2009), for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0(\epsilon)$ such that for each $i = 1, \ldots, m$, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\exp\left[-n\left(J\left(\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}}\right) + \epsilon\right)\right] < w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) < \exp\left[-n\left(J\left(\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}}\right) - \epsilon\right)\right],\ \text{if } \boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}_i^c;\ \text{and} \tag{3.1}$$

$$1 - \exp(n\epsilon)P_{in} < w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) < 1 - \exp(-n\epsilon)P_{in},\ \text{if } \boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}_i, \tag{3.2}$$

where

$$P_{in} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\bar{\mathbb{D}}_i^c : d_i = 1} \exp\left[-n\left(J\left(\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}}\right)\right)\right] + \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\bar{\mathbb{D}}_i^c : d_i = 0} \exp\left[-n\left(J\left(\bar{\Theta}_{i\boldsymbol{d}}\right)\right)\right].$$

Also, for $i = 1, \ldots, m$, and for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\exp\left[-n\left(J\left(H_{1i}\right) + \epsilon\right)\right] < v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) < \exp\left[-n\left(J\left(H_{1i}\right) - \epsilon\right)\right],\ \text{if } d_i^t = 0; \tag{3.3}$$

$$1 - \exp\left[-n\left(J\left(H_{0i}\right) - \epsilon\right)\right] < v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) < 1 - \exp\left[-n\left(J\left(H_{0i}\right) + \epsilon\right)\right],\ \text{if } d_i^t = 1. \tag{3.4}$$

Note that, in the above equations (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3), we have referred to the same ϵ and the same $n_0(\epsilon)$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, m$. This can be arranged thanks to finiteness of m. Also observe that for every $n \geq 1$, $J\left(\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}}\right) > 0$ if $\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}_i^c$, $J\left(H_{1i}\right) > 0$ if $d_i^t = 0$ and $J\left(H_{0i}\right) > 0$ if $d_i^t = 1$.

We first address convergence of $mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(1)})$ to zero when $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}$ is the non-marginal method proposed by Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016). We let $\beta_n^{(1)} = \frac{\lambda_n^{(1)}}{1+\lambda_n^{(1)}}$ denote the threshold associated with $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}$; see (1.5).

3.1 Asymptotic analysis of $mpBFDR$ for the non-marginal multiple testing method

Theorem 2 *Assume conditions (S1)–(S7) of Shalizi. Further assume that*

$$\underline{\beta}^{(1)} = \liminf_{n\geq 1} \beta_n^{(1)} > 0; \tag{3.5}$$

$$\overline{\beta}^{(1)} = \limsup_{n\geq 1} \beta_n^{(1)} < 1. \tag{3.6}$$

Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0(\epsilon) \geq 1$ such that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, the following holds almost surely:

$$\exp\left(-n\epsilon\right) \times \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t P_{in}}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t} \leq mpBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(1)}\right) \leq \exp\left(n\epsilon\right) \times \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t P_{in}}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t}. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, it follows from (3.1) and (3.2) that a lower bound for

$$E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\neq\boldsymbol{0}} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right) \delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right]$$

is given by

$$L_n = \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t(1-e^{-n\epsilon}P_{in})}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t}\right) \times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{d}^t \neq \boldsymbol{0}\right) \tag{3.8}$$

$$+ \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}\setminus\{\boldsymbol{d}^t\}} \left[\left(1 - \frac{\sum_{G_i} d_i(1-e^{-n\epsilon}P_{in})}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right) \times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^* w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^*) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^*, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d}^* \neq \boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{0}\right)\right. \tag{3.9}$$

$$\left. + \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{G_i^c} d_i \exp\left[-n\left(J(\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}}) + \epsilon\right)\right]}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right) \times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^* w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^*) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^*, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d}^* \neq \boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{0}\right)\right], \tag{3.10}$$

where $\sum_{G_i}$ denotes summation over those $i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$ for which all elements of $\boldsymbol{d}_{G_i}$ are correct and $\sum_{G_i^c}$ denotes summation over those $i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$ for which at least one element of $\boldsymbol{d}_{G_i}$ is incorrect. Similarly, an upper bound is given by

$$U_n = \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t(1-e^{n\epsilon}P_{in})}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t}\right) \times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{d}^t \neq \boldsymbol{0}\right) \tag{3.11}$$

$$+ \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}\setminus\{\boldsymbol{d}^t\}} \left[\left(1 - \frac{\sum_{G_i} d_i(1-e^{n\epsilon}P_{in}}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right) \times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^* w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^*) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^*, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d}^* \neq \boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{0}\right)\right. \tag{3.12}$$

$$\left. + \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{G_i^c} d_i \exp\left[-n\left(J(\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}}) - \epsilon\right)\right]}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right) \times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^* w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^*) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^*, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d}^* \neq \boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{0}\right)\right]. \tag{3.13}$$

Since by hypothesis (3.5) and (3.6) hold, by (3.1) and (3.2) we may assume that $n_0(\epsilon)$ is so large that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, $w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) > \beta_n^{(1)}$, $w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) > \beta_n^{(1)}$ for $\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}_i$, and for $\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}_i^c$, $w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) < \beta_n^{(1)}$, for $i = 1,\ldots,m$.

To see the importance of assumptions (3.5) and (3.6), note that in probabilities (3.8) and (3.11), the right hand sides contain the decision configurations of the form $\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(j)}$ where $\tilde{d}_j = 1$ and $d_j^t = 0$ for some

$j \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$ and $\tilde{d}_i = d_i^t$ for $i \neq j$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t > \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i^{(j)} w_{in}\left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(j)}\right) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i^{(j)}$ if and only if $w_{jn}\left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(j)}\right) < \beta_n^{(1)}$. Since $\tilde{d}_j = 1$ and $d_j^t = 0$, it follows that $w_{jn}\left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(j)}\right) \to 0$ almost surely, for $n \to \infty$. Here (3.5) ensures that $w_{jn}\left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(j)}\right) < \beta_n^{(1)}$ for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$.

Now note that in probabilities (3.8) and (3.11), the right hand sides also contain the decisions of forms $\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(j)}$ where $\breve{d}_j = 0$ and $d_j^t = 1$ for some $j \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$ and $\breve{d}_i = d_i^t$ for $i \neq j$. In this case $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t > \sum_{i=1}^m \breve{d}_i^{(j)} w_{in}\left(\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(j)}\right) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m \breve{d}_i^{(j)}$ if and only if $w_{jn}\left(\boldsymbol{d}^t\right) > \beta_n^{(1)}$. Since $w_{jn}\left(\boldsymbol{d}^t\right)$ is the posterior probability of the correct decision, $w_{jn}\left(\boldsymbol{d}^t\right) \to 1$ almost surely, for $n \to \infty$, and (3.6) ensures $w_{jn}\left(\boldsymbol{d}^t\right) > \beta_n^{(1)}$ for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$.

For decisions $\boldsymbol{d}$ other than forms $\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(j)}$ and $\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(j)}$, first let us assume that $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t < \sum_{i=1}^m d_i$. Then, since $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})$ for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i$, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, for any sequence β_n satisfying (3.5). If, on the other hand, $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i$, it follows, since $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t \to (1 - \beta_n^{(1)}) \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t$, and $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i \to (1 - \beta_n^{(1)}) \sum_{i=1}^m d_i$, that $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i$, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, for any sequence β_n such that (3.6) holds.

It then follows that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, the probabilities (3.8) and (3.11) are exactly 1. In the probabilities (3.9), (3.10), (3.12) and (3.13), the true decision configuration $\boldsymbol{d}^t$ features in the right hand sides of the inequalities for one of the events in the intersection with respect to $\boldsymbol{d}^* \neq \boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{0}$, while the left hand sides never correspond to $\boldsymbol{d}^t$ (even though up to $\mathbb{D}_i \setminus \left\{\boldsymbol{d}^t\right\}$, the decisions in the left hand sides of (3.9) and (3.12) are correct). Since $\boldsymbol{d}^t$ is unique (each decision d_i^t either correctly accepts H_{1i} or correctly accepts H_{0i}, and so two different decisions can not be true), it follows that any $\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \left\{\boldsymbol{d}^t\right\}$ must be incorrect, and so, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, the probabilities (3.9), (3.10), (3.12) and (3.13) must be zero. Thus, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$e^{-n\epsilon} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t P_{in}}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t} \leq E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{0}} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right) \delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right] \leq e^{n\epsilon} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t P_{in}}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t}. \quad (3.14)$$

Moreover, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\left(\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}\left(\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{0}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = 0\right) = 1 - P\left(\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}\left(\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{0}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = 1\right) \\
&= 1 - P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) < \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{0}\right) \\
&= 1 - P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) < \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t, \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) < \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{d}^t \neq \boldsymbol{0}\right) \\
&= 1, \qquad (3.15)
\end{aligned}$$

since $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) < \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t$ is not possible for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$. It then follows that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, (3.7) holds. ■

Remark 3 *Let* $x_1 = \min_{i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}} \min_{\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}_i^c : d_i = 1} J\left(\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}}\right)$ *and* $x_2 = \min_{i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}} \min_{\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}_i^c : d_i = 0} J\left(\bar{\Theta}_{i\boldsymbol{d}}\right)$. *Assuming that* $0 < \epsilon < \min\{x_1, x_2\}$, *it follows that* $mpBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(1)}\right) \to 0$ *as* $n \to \infty$.

We now obtain asymptotic bounds of $mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(2)})$ where $\mathcal{M}^{(2)}$ denotes the multiple-testing method of Guindani *et al.* (2009). In a nutshell, the decisions on the hypotheses are obtained in this method by maximizing $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i \left(v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(2)}\right)$, where $0 \leq \beta_n^{(2)} \leq 1$, for $n \geq 1$.

Theorem 4 *Assume conditions (S1)–(S7) of Shalizi. Assume further that*

$$\underline{\beta}^{(2)} = \liminf_{n\geq 1} \beta_n^{(2)} > 0; \tag{3.16}$$

$$\overline{\beta}^{(2)} = \limsup_{n\geq 1} \beta_n^{(2)} < 1. \tag{3.17}$$

Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0(\epsilon) \geq 1$ such that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\exp(-n\epsilon) \times \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t P_{in}}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t} \leq mpBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(2)}\right) \leq \exp(n\epsilon) \times \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t P_{in}}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t}. \tag{3.18}$$

Proof. Since (3.16) and (3.17) hold, by (3.1) and (3.2) we may assume that $n_0(\epsilon)$ is so large that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, $v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) > \beta_n^{(2)}$, if $d_i = 1$ is correct and $v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) < \beta_n^{(2)}$ if $d_i = 0$ is correct, for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. The rest of the proof follows in the same way as the proof of Theorem 2. ■

In other words, $mpBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(1)}\right)$ and $mpBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(2)}\right)$ have the same asymptotic form, provided that their respective thresholds $\beta_n^{(1)}$ and $\beta_n^{(2)}$ are bounded away from 0 and 1.

3.2 Asymptotic analysis of $pBFDR$ for methods $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{(2)}$

The following theorem can be proved in the same way as Theorems 2 and 4.

Theorem 5 *Assume conditions (S1)–(S7) of Shalizi. Let $\beta_n = \beta_n^{(1)}$ or $\beta_n = \beta_n^{(2)}$, where $\beta_n^{(1)}$ satisfies (3.5) and (3.6) and $\beta_n^{(2)}$ satisfies (3.16) and (3.17). Then, for $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{(1)}$ or $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{(2)}$,*

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t \exp\left[-n\left(J(H_{0i}) + \epsilon\right)\right]}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t} \leq pBFDR(\mathcal{M}) \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t \exp\left[-n\left(J(H_{0i}) - \epsilon\right)\right]}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t}. \tag{3.19}$$

3.3 General asymptotic comparison between $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$

From Theorems 2, 4 and 5 it is easy to observe that the asmyptotic form $mpBFDR$ remains the same as (3.7) and that of $pBFDR$ remains the same as (3.19), irrespective of the methodology, provided that the associated expectations of $\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n)$ converge to 1 or 0 accordingly as $\boldsymbol{d}$ is correct or incorrect. This we present formally as the following theorem:

Theorem 6 *Assume conditions (S1)–(S7) of Shalizi. Then, for any consistent multiple testing methodology $\mathcal{M}$, (3.7) and (3.19) hold.*

Since any sensible multiple testing procedure is expected to have such asymptotic property, we can make general asymptotic comparison between $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$. In particular we provide sufficient conditions under which $mpBFDR$ converges to zero at a slower or equal rate as $pBFDR$; we also show that $mpBFDR$ can not have a faster convergence rate compared to $pBFDR$.

Before we state and prove our results we first define some necessary notations. Let

$$i_{\max} = \arg\max_{i:d_i^t=1} P_{in}; \tag{3.20}$$

$$i_{\min} = \arg\min_{i:d_i^t=1} P_{in}; \tag{3.21}$$

$$j_{\max} = \arg\max_{i:d_i^t=1} J(H_{0i}); \tag{3.22}$$

$$j_{\min} = \arg\min_{i:d_i^t=1} J(H_{0i}) \tag{3.23}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{d}_{\min} = \underset{\boldsymbol{d}\in\bar{\mathbb{D}}^c_{i_{\max}}}{\arg\min} \left[\min\left\{J\left(\Theta_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}}\right), J\left(\bar{\Theta}_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}}\right)\right\}\right]; \tag{3.24}$$

$$\boldsymbol{d}_{\max} = \underset{\boldsymbol{d}\in\bar{\mathbb{D}}^c_{i_{\min}}}{\arg\max} \left[\max\left\{J\left(\Theta_{i_{\min}\boldsymbol{d}}\right), J\left(\bar{\Theta}_{i_{\min}\boldsymbol{d}}\right)\right\}\right]. \tag{3.25}$$

Also let us denote by $\Theta^*_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}$ the sets $\Theta_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}$ or $\bar{\Theta}_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}$, where

$$J\left(\Theta^*_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}\right) = \min\left\{J\left(\Theta_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}\right), J\left(\bar{\Theta}_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}\right)\right\}, \tag{3.26}$$

and let $\tilde{\Theta}_{i_{\min}\boldsymbol{d}_{\max}}$ stand for either $\Theta_{i_{\min}\boldsymbol{d}_{\max}}$ or $\bar{\Theta}_{i_{\min}\boldsymbol{d}_{\max}}$, where

$$J\left(\tilde{\Theta}_{i_{\min}\boldsymbol{d}_{\max}}\right) = \max\left\{J\left(\Theta_{i_{\min}\boldsymbol{d}_{\max}}\right), J\left(\bar{\Theta}_{i_{\min}\boldsymbol{d}_{\max}}\right)\right\}. \tag{3.27}$$

The following lemma is necessary for our results on comparison between $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$.

Lemma 7 *Assume conditions (S1)–(S7) of Shalizi. Also assume that*

$$J\left(H_{0j_{\min}}\right) = J\left(H_{0j_{\max}}\right) = c\,(>0), \text{ and} \tag{3.28}$$

$$J\left(\tilde{\Theta}_{i_{\min}\boldsymbol{d}_{\max}}\right) = J\left(\Theta^*_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}\right) = \tilde{c}\,(>0). \tag{3.29}$$

Then $\tilde{c} \le c$.

Proof. Observe that $\Theta_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}^t}$ is associated with the decision configuration that correctly identifies all the hypotheses, and that $\Theta^c_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}^t} \supseteq H_{0i_{\max}}$. Applying Shalizi's theorem to the set $\Theta^c_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}^t}$, it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\pi\left(\Theta^c_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}^t}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = -J\left(\Theta^c_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}^t}\right) \ge \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\pi\left(H_{0i_{\max}}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = -J\left(H_{0i_{\max}}\right) = -c. \tag{3.30}$$

Hence, $J\left(\Theta^c_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}^t}\right) \le c$. From the definition of essential infimum it also follows that $J\left(\Theta^c_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}^t}\right) = J\left(\Theta^*_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}\right)$, yielding

$$\tilde{c} = J\left(\Theta^*_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}\right) \le c.$$

■

The next theorem shows that under conditions (3.28) and (3.29), the convergence rate of $mpBFDR$ can not exceed that of $pBFDR$.

Theorem 8 *Assume (3.28) and (3.29). Let $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ be any two consistent multiple testing procedures in the sense that for $i = 1, 2$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} E\left[\delta_{\mathcal{M}_i}(\boldsymbol{d}^t|\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right] = 1$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} E\left[\delta_{\mathcal{M}_i}(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right] = 0$ for $\boldsymbol{d} \ne \boldsymbol{d}^t$. Then under further assumption of Shalizi's conditions (S1)–(S7), it holds that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\left(\frac{mpBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}_1\right)}{pBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}_2\right)}\right) = c - \tilde{c}. \tag{3.31}$$

Proof. Using (3.20), (3.21) and (3.28) we obtain the following from (3.7), (3.18) and (3.19): for $n \ge n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\exp\left(-2n\epsilon\right) \times \frac{P_{i_{\min}n}}{\exp\left(-nc\right)} \le \frac{mpBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}_1\right)}{pBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}_2\right)} \le \exp\left(2n\epsilon\right) \times \frac{P_{i_{\max}n}}{\exp\left(-nc\right)}. \tag{3.32}$$

Now observe that

$$P_{i_{\max}n} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\bar{\mathbb{D}}^c_{i_{\max}}:d_{i_{\max}}=1} \exp\left(-nJ\left(\Theta_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}}\right)\right) + \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\bar{\mathbb{D}}^c_{i_{\max}}:d_{i_{\max}}=0} \exp\left(-nJ\left(\bar{\Theta}_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}}\right)\right)$$
$$\leq |\bar{\mathbb{D}}^c_{i_{\max}}| \times \exp\left(-nJ\left(\Theta^*_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}\right)\right), \tag{3.33}$$

where $|\bar{\mathbb{D}}^c_{i_{\max}}|$ is the cardinality of the set $\bar{\mathbb{D}}^c_{i_{\max}}$. Hence, the upper bound in (3.32) yields

$$\frac{1}{n}\log\left(\frac{mpBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}_1\right)}{pBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}_2\right)}\right) < 2\epsilon + \frac{1}{n}\log|\bar{\mathbb{D}}^c_{i_{\max}}| - \left(J\left(\Theta^*_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}\right) - c\right). \tag{3.34}$$

Now, from the lower bound in (3.32) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n}\log\left(\frac{mpBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}_1\right)}{pBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}_2\right)}\right) > -2\epsilon + \frac{1}{n}\log|\bar{\mathbb{D}}^c_{i_{\min}}| - \left(J\left(\tilde{\Theta}_{i_{\min}\boldsymbol{d}_{\max}}\right) - c\right). \tag{3.35}$$

The result follows by substituting (3.28) and (3.29) in (3.34) and (3.35). ■

Remark 9 *The main essence of Theorem 8 is that if the marginal posterior probabilities*

$$\left\{\pi\left(H_{0i}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right); i : d^t_i = 1\right\}$$

of false acceptances tend to zero at the same rate $c\ (>0)$ and the joint posterior probabilities

$$\left\{\pi\left(\cap_{j\in G_i} H_{d_j,j}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right); \boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^c_i; i : d^t_i = 1\right\}$$

of wrong decisions tend to zero at the same rate $\tilde{c}\ (>0)$, then these rates completely characterize the limit of $\frac{1}{n}\log\left(\frac{mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}_1)}{pBFDR(\mathcal{M}_2)}\right)$.

Remark 10 *From (3.35) it is clear that the ratio $\frac{mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}_1)}{pBFDR(\mathcal{M}_2)}$ explodes to infinity if $J\left(\tilde{\Theta}_{i_{\min}\boldsymbol{d}_{\max}}\right) < c$ (recall that by Lemma 7, $J\left(\tilde{\Theta}_{i_{\min}\boldsymbol{d}_{\max}}\right) \leq c$). Thus, assumption (3.29) is not required for the ratio to explode to infinity; it is only required to enforce existence of the limit (3.31).*

Remark 11 *Further note that it is not possible to make $\frac{mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}_1)}{pBFDR(\mathcal{M}_2)}$ tend to zero. Indeed, for the same multiple testing procedure it is clear from the definitions (1.9) and (1.11) that $mpBFDR \geq pBFDR$. Even for different multiple testing procedures the asymptotic upper bound of $\frac{mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}_1)}{pBFDR(\mathcal{M}_2)}$ can not go to zero. In this regard, note that the upper bound of the ratio is $\exp(2n\epsilon)\times\exp\left\{J\left(H_{0j_{\max}}\right) - J\left(\Theta^*_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}\right)\right\}$. Since $\Theta^c_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}^t}$ contains $H_{0i_{\max}}$, it follows that $J\left(\Theta^c_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}^t}\right) \leq J\left(H_{0i_{\max}}\right) \leq J\left(H_{0j_{\max}}\right)$. However, by definition, $J\left(\Theta^c_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}^t}\right) = J\left(\Theta^*_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}\right)$, so that $J\left(\Theta^*_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}\right) \leq J\left(H_{0j_{\max}}\right)$. Hence, the asymptotic upper bound of $\frac{mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}_1)}{pBFDR(\mathcal{M}_2)}$ can never tend to zero.*

Remark 12 *Theorem 8 shows that under specific assumptions it is only possible to at most achieve the equality in $J\left(\Theta^*_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}\right) \leq J\left(H_{0j_{\max}}\right)$ ensuring the least possible upper bound. Observe that this least possible upper bound corresponds to the least possible limit of $\frac{1}{n}\log\left(\frac{mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}_1)}{pBFDR(\mathcal{M}_2)}\right)$, among all cases where the limit exists.*

Remark 13 *If the limit of $\frac{1}{n}\log\left(\frac{mpBFDR(a_n)}{pBFDR(b_n)}\right)$ is positive, then the KL-divergence $\tilde{c}$ associated with $mpBFDR$ is smaller than c, the KL-divergence associated with $pBFDR$. Hence, in this case, $mpBFDR$ is asymptotically preferable to $pBFDR$ in this KL-divergence sense. Otherwise, $\tilde{c} = c$, so that $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$ are equally preferable. We formalize this as Theorem 14.*

Theorem 14 *Assume conditions (3.28) and (3.29), in addition to Shalizi's conditions. Then, for any multiple testing procedures, $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$ are equally preferable, that is, $mpBFDR \equiv pBFDR$ if and only if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log\left(\frac{mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}_1)}{pBFDR(\mathcal{M}_2)}\right) = 0$ (equivalently, $\tilde{c} = c$). Otherwise ($\tilde{c} < c$), $mpBFDR$ is preferable to $pBFDR$, that is, $mpBFDR \succ pBFDR$.*

We now investigate conditions under which $mpBFDR \equiv pBFDR$, that is, when the corresponding KL-divergences $\tilde{c}$ and c, are equal. In this regard, we present the following theorem.

Theorem 15 *Assume the following:*

(A1) Equalities (3.28) and (3.29) hold.

(A2) There is at least one false acceptance in $G_{i_{\max}}$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}$, that is,

$$d_{\min,j} = 0 \text{ for some } j \in G_{i_{\max}} \text{ such that } d_j^t = 1. \tag{3.36}$$

Then $\tilde{c} = c$.

Proof. Let us first assume that $\Theta^*_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}} = \Theta_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}$. Then, since by (A2), $d_{\min,j} = 0$ for some $j \in G_{i_{\max}}$, it follows that $\Theta_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}$ is an intersection with H_{0j}. Hence, for every $n \geq 1$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \pi\left(\Theta_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}} | \boldsymbol{X}_n\right) < \frac{1}{n} \log \pi\left(H_{0j} | \boldsymbol{X}_n\right),$$

and so, after taking limits as $n \to \infty$, it holds by Shalizi's theorem and (A1), that

$$\tilde{c} = J\left(\Theta_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}\right) \geq J(H_{0j}) = c. \tag{3.37}$$

If $\Theta^*_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}} = \bar{\Theta}_{i_{\max}\boldsymbol{d}_{\min}}$, then it intersects $H_{0i_{\max}}$, and again (3.37) holds with $J(H_{0j})$ replaced with $J(H_{0i_{\max}})$. In conjunction with Lemma 7 it follows that $\tilde{c} = c$. ■

4 Asymptotic comparison between $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$

Note that under conditions (S1)–(S7) of Shalizi, $d_i^t = 0$ implies

$$\exp\left[-n\left(J\left(\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}^t}\right) + \epsilon\right)\right] < w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) < \exp\left[-n\left(J\left(\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}^t}\right) - \epsilon\right)\right] \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\exp\left[-n\left(J\left(H_{1i}\right) + \epsilon\right)\right] < v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) < \exp\left[-n\left(J\left(H_{1i}\right) - \epsilon\right)\right]. \tag{4.2}$$

Noting that $J\left(\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}^t}\right) = J\left(H_{1i}\right)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$, it follows that $w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t)$ and $v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t)$ have the same lower and upper bounds.

Hence, we obtain the following result:

Theorem 16 *Assume conditions (S1)–(S7) of Shalizi. Then, for any consistent multiple testing method $\mathcal{M}$,*

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i^t) \exp\left[-n\left(J\left(H_{1i}\right) + \epsilon\right)\right]}{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i^t)} \leq mpBFNR(\mathcal{M}) \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i^t) \exp\left[-n\left(J(H_{1i}) - \epsilon\right)\right]}{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i^t)}; \tag{4.3}$$

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i^t) \exp\left[-n\left(J\left(H_{1i}\right) + \epsilon\right)\right]}{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i^t)} \leq pBFNR(\mathcal{M}) \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i^t) \exp\left[-n\left(J(H_{1i}) - \epsilon\right)\right]}{\sum_{i=1}^m (1-d_i^t)}. \tag{4.4}$$

Remark 17 *Theorem 16 shows that irrespective of the multiple testing methods, the asymptotic bounds of $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$ depend only upon $J(H_{1i})$, for those indices i for which $d_i^t = 0$. Hence, if these KL-divergences are the same, then $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$ are equally preferable asymptotically. This is formalized in Theorem 18.*

Theorem 18 *Assume conditions (S1)–(S7) of Shalizi. Let*

$$J(H_{1i}) = c\ (c > 0),\ \textit{for}\ i : d_i^t = 0. \tag{4.5}$$

Then $mpBFNR \equiv pBFNR$ in the sense that for any consistent multiple testing methods $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \left(\frac{mpBFNR(\mathcal{M}_1)}{pBFNR(\mathcal{M}_2)} \right) \to 0, \tag{4.6}$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Proof. From (4.3), (4.4) and (4.5) it follows that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, for any choice of consistent multiple testing methods $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$,

$$\exp(-2n\epsilon) \leq \frac{mpBFNR(\mathcal{M}_1)}{pBFNR(\mathcal{M}_2)} \leq \exp(2n\epsilon).$$

Result (4.6) hence follows.

■

Remark 19 *Theorem 18 remains true for any $\boldsymbol{G} = \{G_1, \ldots, G_m\}$ and any consistent multiple testing methods $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$. In other words, given that (4.5) holds, $mpBFNR(\mathcal{M}_1)$ and $pBFNR(\mathcal{M}_2)$ are always equivalent, irrespective of the choices of $\boldsymbol{G}$, and consistent methods $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$.*

4.1 Summary of the asymptotic results on $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$

Our results show that under the conditions of Shalizi, both $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$ converge to zero, for all consistent multiple testing methods. In particular, for all consistent methods, $mpBFDR$ has the same convergence rate; the same holds true for $pBFDR$. However, as we have shown, under specific assumptions, $mpBFDR$ converges to zero at a slower rate than $pBFDR$, but corresponds to smaller KL-divergence from the truth. On the other hand, $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$ have the same rate of convergence to zero for all consistent methods, provided that the assumptions of Shalizi hold. Hence, even if $mpBFDR$ may converge to zero at a slower rate compared to $pBFDR$ this does not spell out any advantage in terms of the corresponding $mpBFNR$ over $pBFNR$. As we shall show subsequently, the rates of $mpBFNR$ over $pBFNR$ remains equal even when both $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$ are asymptotically controlled at α.

5 Asymptotics of category (a) with asymptotic control of $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$

We now enforce asymptotic control over $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$ in the sense that they converge to $\alpha \in (0, a)$, for $a \leq 1$, instead of zero, and study the asymptotic behaviors of $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$. Here it is important to point out that Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016) prove under mild assumptions that for the non-marginal procedure and the method of Guindani *et al.* (2009), $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$ can be tuned to achieve any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. However, as we show, in the asymptotic case, it is not possible to achieve $\alpha \in (a, 1)$, even with an extra assumption. This is not unexpected, since consistent methods can not commit large errors asymptotically. Hence, there arises the question if α-control of versions of FDR is at all necessary. The answer is that, since it is standard practice in multiple testing methods

to exercise α-control on versions of FDR, and then to address versions of FNR in the hope that controlling versions of FDR will reduce the corresponding FNR, it is important to investigate which values of α will be available for control in large, or even moderately large samples, and for such α's, how small the versions of FNR can be made, and which multiple testing method is the best with respect to smallest FNR when all the methods have controlled FDR at the same available α-level.

As already mentioned in the introduction, we attempt to address these questions with respect to three categories of the multiple testing procedures that we consider. We begin with category (a) that includes in particular, the non-marginal method of Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016), the method of Guindani *et al.* (2009) and the method of Storey (2007).

We begin with the non-marginal methodology $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}$ of Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016). Below we first define some requisite notations. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{D}^* = \big\{\boldsymbol{d} : \exists\, r \in \{1,\ldots,m\} \text{ and indices } \{j_1,\ldots,j_r\} \text{ such that } d_j = 1,\ d_j^t = 0 \\ \text{for } j \in \{j_1,\ldots,j_r\} \text{ and } d_j = d_j^t \text{ for } j \notin \{j_1,\ldots,j_r\}\big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

Let $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}$ denote the set of all $\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}^* \setminus \{\boldsymbol{0}\}$ that disagree with $\boldsymbol{d}^t$ at only one position. For any $\boldsymbol{d} \in \tilde{\mathbb{D}}$, let $j_{\boldsymbol{d}}$ denote the index for which $d_{j_{\boldsymbol{d}}} = 1$ and $d^t_{j_{\boldsymbol{d}}} = 0$. Let $\mathbb{J} = \left\{j_{\boldsymbol{d}} : \boldsymbol{d} \in \tilde{\mathbb{D}}\right\}$. Let us also define

$$Q_{\boldsymbol{d}} = \{i \in \{1,\ldots,m\} : \text{all elements of } \boldsymbol{d}_{G_i} \text{ are correct}\},$$

and let $Q^c_{\boldsymbol{d}}$ denote the complement of $Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}$.

5.1 Convergence of $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$ to α for the non-marginal method

Theorem 20 *In addition to Shalizi's conditions (S1)–(S7), assume the following:*

(B1) $\left\{j_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}\right\} \cap G_i = \emptyset$ *for* $i \neq j_{\boldsymbol{d}}$.

(B2) The posterior probabilities $\pi(\cdot|\boldsymbol{X}_n)$ *are continuous in* $\boldsymbol{X}_n$, *for any* $n \geq 1$.

Let $\alpha \in \left(0, \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i}\right)$ *be the desired level of significance. Then there exists a sequence* $\beta_n^{(1)} \to 0$ *as* $n \to \infty$ *such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} mpBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(1)}\right) = \alpha. \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}&E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\neq\boldsymbol{0}}\left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right)\delta_{\beta_n^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right] \\ &= E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^*\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}}\left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right)\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right] \\ &\quad + E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^{*c}\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}}\left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right)\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

We shall show that there exists a sequence $\beta_n^{(1)} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that the first term of (5.3) tends to α and the second term goes to zero as $n \to \infty$.

Considering the first term, note that for any $\epsilon > 0$, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon) \geq 1$,

$$\tilde{L}_n \leq E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^*\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}}\left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right)\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right] \leq \tilde{U}_n, \tag{5.4}$$

where

$$\tilde{L}_n = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^*\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}} d_i(1-P_{2i}(n,\epsilon)) + \sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}^c} d_i \exp\left(-n(J(\Theta_{i,\boldsymbol{d}})+\epsilon)\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right)$$
$$\times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i > \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i w_{in}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i, \text{ for all } \tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}\neq\boldsymbol{d}\right); \quad (5.5)$$

$$\tilde{U}_n = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^*\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}} d_i(1-P_{1i}(n,\epsilon)) + \sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}^c} d_i \exp\left(-n(J(\Theta_{i,\boldsymbol{d}})-\epsilon)\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right)$$
$$\times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i > \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i w_{in}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i, \text{ for all } \tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}\neq\boldsymbol{d}\right). \quad (5.6)$$

Observe that asymptotically $\sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}^c} d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})$ is maximized for $\boldsymbol{d} = \hat{\boldsymbol{d}} \in \mathbb{D}^*\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}$ such that for exactly one $j_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}} \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$, $\hat{d}_{j_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}} = 1$ where $d^t_{j_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}} = 0$, and for $i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}\setminus\{j_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}\}$, $\hat{d}_i = d_i^t$, and $\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}$ minimizes the KL-divergence $J\left(\cap_{j=1}^m H_{d_j,j}\right)$. Hence, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}^c} \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) > \sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}^c} d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}), \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d}\neq\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}. \quad (5.7)$$

Observe that since $\sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}^c} d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) = 0$ if $\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{d}^t$, (5.7) holds trivially for $\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{d}^t$.

Also, it is easy to see that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}} \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) \geq \sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}} d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}), \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d}\neq\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}. \quad (5.8)$$

Equality holds in the above if $\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{d}^t$.

Then it follows, using (5.7) and (5.8) that for all $\boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{d}^t$, at least for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i &= \sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}} \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) + \sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}^c} \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i \\ &> \sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}} d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) + \sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}^c} d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i\end{aligned}$$

if and only if, at least for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\left(\sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}} \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}} d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})\right) + \left(\sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}^c} \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}^c} d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})\right) > \beta_n^{(1)}\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i - \sum_{i=1}^m d_i\right). \quad (5.9)$$

Recall that

$$\left(\sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}} \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}} d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})\right) = 0$$

if $\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{d}^t$. In that case $\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i = \sum_{i=1}^m d_i$, so that (5.9) holds trivially since $\sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}^c} \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) >$

$\sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}^c} d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})$ even for $\boldsymbol{d}=\boldsymbol{d}^t$. Otherwise,

$$\left(\sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}} \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}} d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})\right) > 0$$

as $n\to\infty$. Hence, any sequence $\beta_n^{(1)}$ such that

$$\beta_n^{(1)} \to 0 \text{ as } n\to\infty, \tag{5.10}$$

satisfies (5.9).

Now note that since, due to assumption (B1), $\sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}} \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) = \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t)$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t \tag{5.11}$$

if and only if

$$\sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}^c} \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) = w_{j_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) > \beta_n^{(1)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i - \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t\right) = \beta_n^{(1)}, \tag{5.12}$$

where the last equality can be seen to hold because $\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i = \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t + 1$. Here we note that assumption (B1) plays a crucial role with respect to (5.12). To clarify, first observe that $\sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}} \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) = \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t)$ does not necessarily hold without this assumption. Hence, without this assumption, (5.11) holds if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) > \beta_n^{(1)}$. Further suppose that $j_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}$ intersects $\{G_{i_k} : k=1,\ldots,K\}$ where $1\le K\le m$, say, where $i_k \ne j_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}$ for $k=1,\ldots,K$. In this case it is clear that $\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) < 0$ for $n\ge n_0(\epsilon)$.

It follows from (5.9), (5.10), (5.11), (5.12), that

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d}\ne\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}\right) \\ = P\left(w_{j_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) > \beta_n^{(1)}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

To ensure that

$$P\left(w_{j_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) > \beta_n^{(1)}\right) \to \tilde{\alpha} \tag{5.14}$$

as $n\to\infty$, it is necessary to select the sequence $\beta_n^{(1)}$ such that

$$\beta_n^{(1)} = C_n \gamma_n, \tag{5.15}$$

where γ_n is given by

$$\gamma_n = \exp\left\{-nJ\left(\cap_{i=1}^m H_{\hat{d}_j,j}\right)\right\}. \tag{5.16}$$

Thanks to assumption (B2), the sequence C_n (>0) in (5.15) can be chosen such that (5.14) holds.

It also follows from (5.9) and (5.10) (in particular, (5.15)), that for $\boldsymbol{d}^*\in\mathbb{D}^*\setminus\{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}\}$,

$$P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^* w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^*) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^* > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d}\ne\boldsymbol{d}^*\right) = 0. \tag{5.17}$$

Using (5.14) and (5.17) along with the facts

$$\sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}} d_i(1-P_{1i}(n,\epsilon)) \to \sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}} d_i$$

and

$$\sum_{i\in Q_{\boldsymbol{d}}^c} d_i \exp\left(-n(J(\Theta_{i,\boldsymbol{d}})+\epsilon)\right) \to 0$$

as $n\to\infty$, it follows that the lower bound (5.5) satisfies

$$\tilde{L}_n \to \tilde{\alpha}\left(1-\frac{\sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}}\hat{d}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i}\right), \tag{5.18}$$

as $n\to\infty$. In the same way it follows that, as $n\to\infty$,

$$\tilde{U}_n \to \tilde{\alpha}\left(1-\frac{\sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}}\hat{d}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i}\right). \tag{5.19}$$

Hence, from (5.4), (5.18) and (5.19), and observing, using assumption (B1), that $\sum_{i\in Q_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}}\hat{d}_i = \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i - 1$, it follows that

$$E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^*\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}}\left(1-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i}\right)\right] \to \frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i}, \text{ as } n\to\infty. \tag{5.20}$$

Note that $\tilde{\alpha}$ will be chosen as

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i. \tag{5.21}$$

Since $0<\tilde{\alpha}\le 1$, we must have $0<\alpha\le\frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i}$.

We now show that

$$E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^{*c}\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}}\left(1-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right)\delta_{\beta_n^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right] \to 0, \tag{5.22}$$

as $n\to\infty$. All we need to ensure is that the true decision configuration $\boldsymbol{d}^t\in\mathbb{D}^{*c}\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}$ is also the asymptotic maximizer of the non-marginal criterion with probability remaining positive even as $n\to\infty$. The rest is similar to the proof of Theorem 2, with $\mathbb{D}$ replaced with $\mathbb{D}^{*c}\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}$. In this regard, let us first consider configurations of the form $\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}\in\mathbb{D}^*$. Since $\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}$ is the maximizer of $\sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i w_{in}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i$ among all $\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}\in\mathbb{D}^*$, it is enough to compare $\boldsymbol{d}^t$ with $\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}$ with respect to maximization. Observe that $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t > \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i w_{in}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}\right) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i$ if and only if $w_{j_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}n}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}\right) < \beta_n^{(1)}$. For $\beta_n^{(1)}$ of the form (5.15), it follows using (5.14), that this event has the probability tending to $(1-\tilde{\alpha})$ as $n\to\infty$.

Now note that $\mathbb{D}^{*c}\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}$ contains decisions of forms $\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}$ where $\breve{d}_j = 0$ and $d_j^t = 1$ for some $j\in\{1,\ldots,m\}$ and $\breve{d}_i = d_i^t$ for $i\ne j$. In this case $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t > \sum_{i=1}^m \breve{d}_i w_{in}\left(\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}\right) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \breve{d}_i$ if and only if $w_{jn}\left(\boldsymbol{d}^t\right) > \beta_n^{(1)}$. Since $w_{jn}\left(\boldsymbol{d}^t\right)$ is the posterior probability of the correct decision, $w_{jn}\left(\boldsymbol{d}^t\right)\to 1$ almost surely, for $n\to\infty$, and since $\beta_n^{(1)}\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$, it is clear that $w_{jn}\left(\boldsymbol{d}^t\right) > \beta_n^{(1)}$ for $n\ge n_0(\epsilon)$.

For decisions $\boldsymbol{d}$ other than forms $\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}$ and $\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}$, first let us assume that $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t < \sum_{i=1}^m d_i$. Then, since $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})$ for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i$, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, for any sequence $\beta_n^{(1)} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. If, on the other hand, $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i$, it follows, since $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t \to (1-\beta_n^{(1)}) \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t$, and $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i \to (1-\beta_n^{(1)}) \sum_{i=1}^m d_i$, that $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i$, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, for any sequence $\beta_n^{(1)} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Combining the above arguments it follows that $\boldsymbol{d}^t$ is the maximizer with probability tending to $(1-\tilde{\alpha})$, as $n \to \infty$. ■

Remark 21 *Theorem 20 holds when $G_i \subset \{1,\ldots,m\}$ for at least one $i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$. But if $G_i = \{1,\ldots,m\}$ for $i = 1,\ldots,m$, then $mpBFDR \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, for any sequence $\beta_n^{(1)} \in [0,1]$. This is because in this case there does not exist any $\boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{d}^t$ such that*

$$P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) > \beta_n^{(1)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i - \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t\right)\right) > 0,$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Remark 22 *Assumption (B1) seems to be somewhat awkward from the practical perspective. Firstly, it may be difficult in realistic situations to extract a single hypothesis that is not correlated with the other groups of dependent hypotheses. Secondly, even if such extraction is possible, it is unknown if the null is true for that isolated hypothesis. To handle this, we suggest selecting the hypothesis that minimizes the minimum a priori correlation with all other hypotheses, and consider a Bayesian marginal test under the "$0-1$" loss; if the null is accepted, then that hypothesis can be extracted; otherwise, we repeat the procedure leaving out this hypothesis from the set of hypotheses, until the null is accepted for some hypothesis. Admittedly this is an ad-hoc, but sensible procedure, and if m is large, it really does not matter which hypothesis is chosen to be isolated.*

We now show that the same asymptotic result as Theorem 20 is achieved when the method of Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016) is replaced with that of Guindani *et al.* (2009), without assumption (B1).

Theorem 23 *Assume conditions (S1)–(S7) of Shalizi, (B2) of Theorem 20 and let $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i}$ be the desired level of significance. Then there exists a sequence $\beta_n^{(2)} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} mpBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(2)}\right) = \alpha. \tag{5.23}$$

Proof. In (5.5) and (5.6) of Theorem 20 it is only required to replace the probabilities

$$P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i > \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i w_{in}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i, \text{ for all } \tilde{\boldsymbol{d}} \neq \boldsymbol{d}\right)$$

by

$$P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(2)} \sum_{i=1}^m d_i > \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i v_{in}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(2)} \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i, \text{ for all } \tilde{\boldsymbol{d}} \neq \boldsymbol{d}\right), \tag{5.24}$$

where $\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}^* \setminus \{\boldsymbol{0}\}$.

Let $\breve{\boldsymbol{d}} = (\breve{d}_1,\ldots,\breve{d}_m)^T$ denote the maximizer of $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i v_{in}$ for $\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}^* \setminus \{\boldsymbol{0}\}$. Note that asymptotically (that is, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon) \geq 1$), $\breve{\boldsymbol{d}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{d}}$, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}$ is the asymptotic maximizer of $\sum_{i \in Q_d^c} d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})$

associated with Theorem 20. Then, for all $\boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{d}^t$, and for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \breve{d}_i v_{in}(\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})\right) > \beta_n^{(2)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \breve{d}_i - \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i\right) \tag{5.25}$$

if

$$\beta_n^{(2)} \to 0, \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Not that $\sum_{i=1}^{m} \breve{d}_i v_{in}(\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}) = v_{j_{\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}} n}(\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i^t v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{m} \breve{d}_i - \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i = 1$, so that (5.25) holds for $\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{d}^t$ if and only if $v_{j_{\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}} n}(\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}) > \beta_n^{(2)}$.

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{d}_i v_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(2)} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{d}_i > \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(2)} \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{d}}\right) \\ = P\left(v_{j_{\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}} n}(\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}) > \beta_n^{(2)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\breve{\boldsymbol{d}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{d}}$ and $v_{j_{\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}} n}(\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}) = w_{j_{\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}} n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}})$, it follows that to ensure

$$P\left(v_{j_{\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}} n}(\breve{\boldsymbol{d}}) > \beta_n^{(2)}\right) \to \tilde{\alpha}, \tag{5.26}$$

one can choose

$$\beta_n^{(2)} = \beta_n^{(1)} = C_n \gamma_n, \tag{5.27}$$

as given by (5.15). Result (5.23) now follows in the same way as in Theorem 20. ■

The results and the proofs with respect to $pBFDR$ are similar; we present the results and brief discussions of the proofs.

Theorem 24 *Let $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{d}_i}$ be the desired level of significance. Then under Shalizi's conditions, assumption (B1) and (B2) of Theorem 20 there exists a sequence $\beta_n^{(1)} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} pBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(1)}\right) = \alpha. \tag{5.28}$$

Proof. In this case, for any $\epsilon > 0$, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon) \geq 1$,

$$\breve{L}_n \leq E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{D}^* \setminus \{\boldsymbol{0}\}} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i}\right) \delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{d} | \boldsymbol{X}_n)\right] \leq \breve{U}_n, \tag{5.29}$$

where

$$\breve{L}_n = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^*\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i\in\breve{Q}_{\boldsymbol{d}}} d_i(1-\exp\{-n\left(J\left(H_{0i}\right)+\epsilon\right)\}) + \sum_{i\in\breve{Q}^c_{\boldsymbol{d}}} d_i \exp\{-n(J(H_{1i})+\epsilon)\}}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right) \times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i > \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i w_{in}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i, \text{ for all } \tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}\neq\boldsymbol{d}\right); \tag{5.30}$$

$$\breve{U}_n = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^*\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i\in\breve{Q}_{\boldsymbol{d}}} d_i(1-\exp\{-n\left(J\left(H_{0i}\right)-\epsilon\right)\}) + \sum_{i\in\breve{Q}^c_{\boldsymbol{d}}} d_i \exp\{-n(J(H_{1i})-\epsilon)\}}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right) \times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i > \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i w_{in}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i, \text{ for all } \tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}\neq\boldsymbol{d}\right). \tag{5.31}$$

In the above, $\breve{Q}_{\boldsymbol{d}} = \{i \in \{1,\ldots,m\} : d_i = 1 \text{ is correct}\}$, and $\breve{Q}^c_{\boldsymbol{d}}$ is the complement of $\breve{Q}_{\boldsymbol{d}}$.

The rest of the proof follows as that of Theorem 20, with $\beta_n^{(1)}$ given by (5.15). ■

Theorem 25 *Let $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i}$ be the desired level of significance. Then, under the assumptions of Shalizi and condition (B2) of Theorem 20, there exists a sequence $\beta_n^{(2)} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} pBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(2)}\right) = \alpha. \tag{5.32}$$

Proof. Observing that in the lower and upper bounds of $E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^*\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}}\left(1-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i}\right)\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right]$ given by (5.30) and (5.31), the probability

$$P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i > \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i w_{in}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i, \text{ for all } \tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}\neq\boldsymbol{d}\right)$$

is to be replaced with $P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(2)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i > \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i v_{in}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(2)}\sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{d}_i, \text{ for all } \tilde{\boldsymbol{d}}\neq\boldsymbol{d}\right)$, the rest of the proof follows in the same way as Theorem 23, with $\beta_n^{(2)}$ given by (5.27). ■

5.2 Convergence of $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$ to zero when $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$ are asymptotically controlled at α

Let

$$J_1 = \min_{i:\hat{d}_i=0} J\left(\Theta_{i\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}\right); \tag{5.33}$$

$$J_2 = \min_{i:\hat{d}_i=0} J\left(H_{1i}\right). \tag{5.34}$$

Since $\hat{d}_i = 0$ must be correct, it follows that H_{1i} and hence $\Theta_{i\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}$ correspond to incorrect decisions, so that by Shalizi's theorem both $J\left(H_{1i}\right)$ and $J\left(\Theta_{i\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}\right)$ are the KL-divergences associated with posterior probabilities of incorrect decisions. By Shalizi's result it follows that $J\left(\Theta_{i\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}\right) \geq J\left(H_{1i}\right)$, for $i = 1,\ldots,m$, so that $J_1 \geq J_2$.

Now note that $\{i : \hat{d}_i = 0\} \subset \{i : d_i^t = 0\}$. Hence,

$$J_1 \geq \min_{i:d_i^t=0} J\left(\Theta_{i\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}\right) = J_1^t \text{ (say)}; \tag{5.35}$$

$$J_2 \geq \min_{i:d_i^t=0} J\left(H_{1i}\right) = J_2^t \text{ (say)}. \tag{5.36}$$

We define

$$\gamma_{1n}(\epsilon) = \exp\left\{-n\left(J_1 - \epsilon\right)\right\}; \tag{5.37}$$

$$\gamma_{2n}(\epsilon) = \exp\left\{-n\left(J_2 - \epsilon\right)\right\}; \tag{5.38}$$

$$\gamma_n^t(\epsilon) = \exp\left\{-n\left(J_2^t - \epsilon\right)\right\}. \tag{5.39}$$

Since $J_1 \geq J_2 \geq J_2^t$, we must have

$$\gamma_{1n}(\epsilon) \leq \gamma_{2n}(\epsilon) \leq \gamma_n^t(\epsilon). \tag{5.40}$$

We then have the following theorem.

Theorem 26 *Assume the conditions of Theorem 20. Then, for $\beta_n^{(1)}$ given by (5.15), for any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$mpBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(1)}\right) = O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right), \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{5.41}$$

Proof. Using the same ideas as in the proof of Theorem 20, here it is easy to see that

$$L_{1n} \leq E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^*\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m(1-d_i)w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m(1-d_i)}\right)\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right] \leq U_{1n}, \tag{5.42}$$

where

$$L_{1n} = \left(\frac{\sum_{i:\hat{d}_i=0}\exp\left\{-n\left(J\left(\Theta_{i\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}\right)+\epsilon\right)\right\}}{\sum_{i:\hat{d}_i=0}(1-\hat{d}_i)}\right) \times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{d}}\right); \tag{5.43}$$

$$U_{1n} = \left(\frac{\sum_{i:\hat{d}_i=0}\exp\left\{-n\left(J\left(\Theta_{i\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}}\right)-\epsilon\right)\right\}}{\sum_{i:\hat{d}_i=0}(1-\hat{d}_i)}\right) \times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{d}}\right). \tag{5.44}$$

It follows from (5.13), (5.14) and (5.15), that

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{d}}\right) \\ &= P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t\right) \\ &\to \tilde{\alpha}, \text{ as } n \to \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{5.45}$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}$ is given by (5.21). Combining (5.44), (5.45) and (5.40) yields

$$E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^*\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m(1-d_i)w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m(1-d_i)}\right)\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right]=O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right). \tag{5.46}$$

Now observe that

$$L_{2n}\leq E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^{*c}\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m(1-d_i)w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m(1-d_i)}\right)\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right]\leq U_{2n}, \tag{5.47}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}L_{2n}=&\left(\frac{\sum_{i:d_i^t=0}\exp\left\{-n\left(J\left(\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}^t}\right)+\epsilon\right)\right\}}{\sum_{i:d_i^t=0}(1-d_i^t)}\right)\\&\times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t)-\beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t>\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})-\beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i,\ \text{for all } \boldsymbol{d}\neq\boldsymbol{d}^t\right);\end{aligned} \tag{5.48}$$

$$\begin{aligned}U_{2n}=&\left(\frac{\sum_{i:d_i^t=0}\exp\left\{-n\left(J\left(\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}^t}\right)-\epsilon\right)\right\}}{\sum_{i:d_i^t=0}(1-d_i^t)}\right)\\&\times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t)-\beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t>\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})-\beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i,\ \text{for all } \boldsymbol{d}\neq\boldsymbol{d}^t\right).\end{aligned} \tag{5.49}$$

Observe that $\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}^t}$ corresponds to incorrect decision at index i only, and so $J\left(\Theta_{i\boldsymbol{d}^t}\right)=J\left(H_{1i}\right)$. Now, it follows from (5.45) that

$$\begin{aligned}&P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t)-\beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t>\sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})-\beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i,\ \text{for all } \boldsymbol{d}\neq\boldsymbol{d}^t\right)\\&=P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t)-\beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t>\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}})-\beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i\right)\\&\to(1-\tilde{\alpha}),\ \text{as } n\to\infty.\end{aligned} \tag{5.50}$$

Combining (5.50) with (5.49) shows that

$$E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^{*c}\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m(1-d_i)w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m(1-d_i)}\right)\delta_{\mathcal{M}_n^{(1)}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right]=O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right). \tag{5.51}$$

Combining (5.46) and (5.51) it follows that

$$mpBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(1)}\right)=O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right).$$

■

The next theorem shows that $mpBFNR$ associated with $\mathcal{M}^{(2)}$ is also of the order $\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)$.

Theorem 27 *Assume the conditions of Shalizi and condition (B2) of Theorem 26. Then for $\beta_n^{(2)}$ given by (5.27), for any $\epsilon>0$,*

$$mpBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(2)}\right)=O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right),\ \textit{as } n\to\infty. \tag{5.52}$$

Proof. The proof remains the same as that of Theorem 26 noting that for $\beta_n^{(2)}$ given by (5.27), due to (5.26),

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\hat{d}_i v_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}})-\beta_n^{(2)}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\hat{d}_i>\sum_{i=1}^{m}d_i v_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}})-\beta_n^{(2)}\sum_{i=1}^{m}d_i,\ \text{for all } \boldsymbol{d}\neq\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}\right)\\
&=P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\hat{d}_i v_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}})-\beta_n^{(2)}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\hat{d}_i>\sum_{i=1}^{m}d_i^t v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t)-\beta_n^{(2)}\sum_{i=1}^{m}d_i^t\right)\\
&\to\tilde{\alpha},\ \text{as } n\to\infty,
\end{aligned}\tag{5.53}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}d_i^t v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t)-\beta_n^{(2)}\sum_{i=1}^{m}d_i^t>\sum_{i=1}^{m}d_i v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})-\beta_n^{(2)}\sum_{i=1}^{m}d_i,\ \text{for all } \boldsymbol{d}\neq\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}\right)\\
&=P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}d_i^t v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t)-\beta_n^{(2)}\sum_{i=1}^{m}d_i^t>\sum_{i=1}^{m}\hat{d}_i v_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}})-\beta_n^{(2)}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\hat{d}_i\right)\\
&\to(1-\tilde{\alpha}),\ \text{as } n\to\infty.
\end{aligned}\tag{5.54}$$

■

For $pBFNR$ associated with $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}$, the following result holds.

Theorem 28 *For $\beta_n^{(1)}$ given by (5.15), for any $\epsilon>0$, under the assumptions of Theorem 26,*

$$pBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(1)}\right)=O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right),\ \textit{as } n\to\infty.\tag{5.55}$$

Proof. In this case,

$$L_{3n}\leq E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^*\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m}(1-d_i)v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^{m}(1-d_i)}\right)\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right]\leq U_{3n},\tag{5.56}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{3n}=&\left(\frac{\sum_{i:\hat{d}_i=0}\exp\left\{-n\left(J\left(H_{1i}\right)+\epsilon\right)\right\}}{\sum_{i:\hat{d}_i=0}(1-\hat{d}_i)}\right)\\
&\times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}})-\beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\hat{d}_i>\sum_{i=1}^{m}d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})-\beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^{m}d_i,\ \text{for all } \boldsymbol{d}\neq\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}\right);
\end{aligned}\tag{5.57}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
U_{3n}=&\left(\frac{\sum_{i:\hat{d}_i=0}\exp\left\{-n\left(J\left(H_{1i}\right)-\epsilon\right)\right\}}{\sum_{i:\hat{d}_i=0}(1-\hat{d}_i)}\right)\\
&\times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\hat{d}_i w_{in}(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}})-\beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\hat{d}_i>\sum_{i=1}^{m}d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})-\beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^{m}d_i,\ \text{for all } \boldsymbol{d}\neq\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}\right).
\end{aligned}\tag{5.58}$$

It follows that

$$E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^*\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m}(1-d_i)v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^{m}(1-d_i)}\right)\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right]=O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right).\tag{5.59}$$

Now observe that

$$L_{4n} \leq E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^{*c}\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m(1-d_i)v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m(1-d_i)}\right)\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right] \leq U_{4n}, \tag{5.60}$$

where

$$L_{4n} = \left(\frac{\sum_{i:d_i^t=0}\exp\left\{-n\left(J\left(H_{1i}\right)+\epsilon\right)\right\}}{\sum_{i:d_i^t=0}(1-d_i^t)}\right) \times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d}\neq\boldsymbol{d}^t\right); \tag{5.61}$$

$$U_{4n} = \left(\frac{\sum_{i:d_i^t=0}\exp\left\{-n\left(J\left(H_{1i}\right)-\epsilon\right)\right\}}{\sum_{i:d_i^t=0}(1-d_i^t)}\right) \times P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^t > \sum_{i=1}^m d_i w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n^{(1)}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i, \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{d}\neq\boldsymbol{d}^t\right). \tag{5.62}$$

It is easily seen, using (5.45) and (5.50), that

$$E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\in\mathbb{D}^{*c}\setminus\{\boldsymbol{0}\}}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m(1-d_i)v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^m(1-d_i)}\right)\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}}\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right] = O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right). \tag{5.63}$$

Result (5.55) follows by combining (5.59) and (5.63). ■

The same asymptotic result holds for $pBFNR$ associated with $\mathcal{M}^{(2)}$:

Theorem 29 *Assume Shalizi's conditions and condition (B2) of Theorem 26. Then, for $\beta_n^{(2)}$ given by (5.27),*

$$pBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}_n^{(2)}\right) = O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right), \text{ as } n\to\infty. \tag{5.64}$$

Proof. Using (5.53) and (5.54), the rest of the proof follows in the same way as that of Theorem 28 ■

The next theorem formalizes that $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$ are equally preferable.

Theorem 30 *Assume (4.5) and the conditions of Theorem 26. Then*

$$\frac{1}{n}\log\left(\frac{mpBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}_1\right)}{pBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}_2\right)}\right) \to 0, \text{ as } n\to\infty, \tag{5.65}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{M}^{(1)}$ or $\mathcal{M}^{(2)}$, and $\mathcal{M}_2 = \mathcal{M}^{(1)}$ or $\mathcal{M}^{(2)}$, where $\beta_n^{(1)}$ and $\beta_n^{(2)}$ are given by (5.15) (equivalently, by (5.27)).

Proof. From the forms of the lower and upper bounds of $mpBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}_1\right)$ and $pBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}_2\right)$ associated with the proofs of Theorems 26 – 29, and using (4.5) it is easily seen that the lower bounds of the above quantities are asymptotically equivalent to $(1-\tilde{\alpha})\exp\left\{-n(c+\epsilon)\right\}$ and the upper bounds are asymptotically equivalent to $(1-\tilde{\alpha})\exp\left\{-n(c-\epsilon)\right\}$, irrespective of the choices of $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{(2)}$. Here, we say that two sequences s_{1n} and s_{2n} are asymptotically equivalent if $s_{1n}/s_{2n}\to 1$ as $n\to\infty$.

From the aforementioned asymptotic equivalences of the lower and upper bounds, result (5.65) easily follows.

■

5.3 Asymptotic theory of the multiple testing method of Storey (2007)

Storey (2007) proposed the following multiple testing procedure. Let there be m tests to be performed with observed, n-dimensional data vectors $\mathbf{x}_{1n}, \mathbf{x}_{2n}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{mn}$, where for $i = 1, \ldots, m$, the i-th test is associated with null density f_i and alternative density g_i. Assuming, without loss of generality, that H_{0i} is true for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$ and H_{1i} is true for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$, Storey (2007) defined

$$S(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{g_{k_0+1}(\mathbf{x}) + g_{k_0+2}(\mathbf{x}) + \cdots + g_m(\mathbf{x})}{f_1(\mathbf{x}) + f_2(\mathbf{x}) + \cdots + f_{k_0}(\mathbf{x})}, \tag{5.66}$$

and suggested rejection of H_{0i} if and only if $S(\mathbf{x}_i) \geq \lambda$, for some $0 \leq \lambda < \infty$.

To study the asymptotic properties of the method we assume the following:

(C1) For $i = 1, \ldots, m$, $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{in})^T$, where $\{x_{ij}; j = 1, \ldots, n\}$ are iid observations.

(C2) For $i = 1, \ldots, m$, f_i and g_i belong to the Lebesgue measure dominated location-scale family, with density at $\mathbf{x}_n = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)^T$ given by

$$f_i(\mathbf{x}_n) = f_i(\mathbf{x}_n|\theta_{0i}) = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\sigma_{0i}} f_i\left(\frac{x_j - \theta_{0i}}{\sigma_{0i}}\right); \tag{5.67}$$

$$g_i(\mathbf{x}_n) = g_i(\mathbf{x}_n|\theta_{1i}) = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\sigma_{1i}} g_i\left(\frac{x_j - \theta_{1i}}{\sigma_{1i}}\right). \tag{5.68}$$

and that we wish to test $H_{0i} : \theta_i \in \Theta_{0i}$ versus $H_{1i} : \theta_i \in \Theta_{1i}$ assuming σ_{0i} and σ_{1i} to be known.

(C3) For each $i = 1, \ldots, m$, there exist complete and sufficient statistics of dimension less than n for both f_i and g_i.

(C4) For $i = 1, \ldots, m$, $\log f_i$ and $\log g_i$ are locally integrable with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

(C5) $n \geq 3$.

By Corollary 1.2 of Mattner (2000) it follows due to (C1)–(C5), that for $i = 1, \ldots, m$, f_i and g_i are normal densities. Hence, letting $\bar{x}_n = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j}{n}$, the following are seen to hold:

$$f_i(\mathbf{x}_n) = f_i(\mathbf{x}_n|\theta_{0i}) = \exp\left\{-\frac{n(\bar{x}_n - \theta_{0i})^2}{\sigma_{0i}^2}\right\} \times \exp\left\{-\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n}(x_j - \bar{x}_n)^2}{\sigma_{0i}^2}\right\}; \tag{5.69}$$

$$g_i(\mathbf{x}_n) = g_i(\mathbf{x}_n|\theta_{1i}) = \exp\left\{-\frac{n(\bar{x}_n - \theta_{1i})^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2}\right\} \times \exp\left\{-\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n}(x_j - \bar{x}_n)^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2}\right\}. \tag{5.70}$$

If $\mathbf{x}_n \sim f_i(\cdot|\theta_{0i})$, then

$$\exp\left\{-\frac{n(\bar{x}_n - \theta_{0i})^2}{\sigma_{0i}^2}\right\} \sim \exp(-\chi_1^2), \tag{5.71}$$

where χ_1^2 is the chi-squared random variable with one degree of freedom.

On the other hand, if $\mathbf{x}_n \sim g_i(\cdot|\theta_{1i})$, then

$$\exp\left\{-\frac{n(\bar{x}_n - \theta_{1i})^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2}\right\} \sim \exp(-\chi_1^2). \tag{5.72}$$

Now observe that if $\mathbf{x}_n \sim f_\ell(\cdot|\theta_{0\ell})$ for some $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{n(\bar{x}_n - \theta_{1i})^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2} &= \frac{\sigma_{0\ell}^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2}\left[\frac{n(\bar{x}_n - \theta_{0\ell})^2}{\sigma_{0\ell}^2} - \frac{2n(\bar{x}_n - \theta_{0\ell})(\theta_{1i} - \theta_{0\ell})}{\sigma_{0\ell}^2} + \frac{n(\theta_{1i} - \theta_{0\ell})^2}{\sigma_{0\ell}^2}\right] \\ &\geq \frac{\sigma_{0\ell}^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2}\left[\frac{n(\bar{x}_n - \theta_{0\ell})^2}{\sigma_{0\ell}^2} - 2\frac{\sqrt{n}|\bar{x}_n - \theta_{0\ell}|}{\sigma_{0\ell}} \times \frac{\sqrt{n}|\theta_{1i} - \theta_{0\ell}|}{\sigma_{0\ell}} + \frac{n(\theta_{1i} - \theta_{0\ell})^2}{\sigma_{0\ell}^2}\right]. \quad (5.73)\end{aligned}$$

For $n \geq 1$, $\frac{n(\bar{x}_n - \theta_{0\ell})^2}{\sigma_{0\ell}^2} \sim \chi_1^2$, and $\frac{\sqrt{n}|\bar{x}_n - \theta_{0\ell}|}{\sigma_{0\ell}} \sim |N(0,1)|$, that is, both the quantities remain finite random variables for all $n \geq 1$. Hence, it easily follows that the quantity (5.73) diverges to infinity, almost surely. In other words,

$$\frac{n(\bar{x}_n - \theta_{1i})^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty, \text{ if } \mathbf{x}_n \sim f_\ell(\cdot|\theta_{0\ell}) \text{ for some } \ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\}. \quad (5.74)$$

In the same way,

$$\frac{n(\bar{x}_n - \theta_{0i})^2}{\sigma_{0i}^2} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty, \text{ if } \mathbf{x}_n \sim g_\ell(\cdot|\theta_{1\ell}) \text{ for some } \ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\}. \quad (5.75)$$

Since $\sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - \bar{x}_n)^2$ also remains a finite quantity almost surely for all $n \geq 1$, it follows that

$$f_i(\mathbf{x}_n|\theta_{0i}) \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{almost surely as } n \to \infty, \text{ if } \mathbf{x}_n \sim f_\ell(\cdot|\theta_{0\ell}) \text{ for some } \ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\}; \\ \to 0 & \text{almost surely as } n \to \infty, \text{ if } \mathbf{x}_n \sim g_\ell(\cdot|\theta_{1\ell}) \text{ for some } \ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\}, \end{cases} \quad (5.76)$$

and

$$g_i(\mathbf{x}_n|\theta_{1i}) \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{almost surely as } n \to \infty, \text{ if } \mathbf{x}_n \sim g_\ell(\cdot|\theta_{1\ell}) \text{ for some } \ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\}; \\ \to 0 & \text{almost surely as } n \to \infty, \text{ if } \mathbf{x}_n \sim f_\ell(\cdot|\theta_{0\ell}) \text{ for some } \ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\}. \end{cases} \quad (5.77)$$

It then follows that

$$S(\mathbf{x}_{in}) \begin{cases} \to \infty & \text{almost surely as } n \to \infty, \text{ if } \mathbf{x}_{in} \sim g_i(\cdot|\theta_{1i}); \\ \to 0 & \text{almost surely as } n \to \infty, \text{ if } \mathbf{x}_{in} \sim f_i(\cdot|\theta_{0i}). \end{cases} \quad (5.78)$$

Without loss of generality, let us assume that H_{0i} is true for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$ and H_{1i} is true for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$. Then it follows from (5.78) that as $n \to \infty$, $d_i = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$ and $d_i = 1$ for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$, almost surely. That is, as $n \to \infty$, $\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{d}^t$, almost surely. We formalize the result as the following lemma.

Lemma 31 *Let λ_n be a sequence of thresholds associated with Storey's method satisfying $\liminf_{n\geq 1} \lambda_n > 0$ and $\limsup_{n\geq 1} \lambda_n < \infty$. Then, under conditions (C1)–(C5), the multiple testing method of Storey is consistent.*

Theorem 6 asserts that under Shalizi's assumptions, for all consistent multiple testing methods, $mpBFDR$ has the same asymptotic form (3.7) and $pBFDR$ has the same asymptotic form (3.19). Moreover, Theorem 16 shows that for all consistent multiple testing methods, $mpBFNR$ has the same asymptotic form (4.3) and $pBFNR$ has the same asymptotic form (4.4), assuming that Shalizi's conditions hold. Hence, these are applicable to Storey's method, which is consistent under conditions (C1)–(C5) along with the assumptions $\liminf_{n\geq 1} \lambda_n > 0$ and $\limsup_{n\geq 1} \lambda_n < \infty$.

Regarding convergence of $pBFDR$ and $mpBFDR$ for Storey's method to α, we first note that the procedure of Storey is equivalent to maximizing $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i S(\mathbf{x}_{in}) - \lambda \sum_{i=1}^m d_i$ with respect to $(d_1, \ldots, d_m)$.

Then we have the following theorems, the proofs of which follow by replacing $v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})$ of the proofs of Theorems 23 and 27 with $S(\mathbf{x}_i)$.

Theorem 32 *Assume the conditions of Shalizi. Let $\mathcal{M}^{(3)}$ denote Storey's multiple testing procedure, and let $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{d}_i}$ be the desired level of significance. Then under conditions (C1)–(C5) and conditions (B1) and (B2) of Theorem 20, there exists a sequence $\lambda_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that, for any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$mpBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(3)}\right) \to \alpha, \text{ as } n \to \infty; \tag{5.79}$$

$$mpBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(3)}\right) = O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right), \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{5.80}$$

Theorem 33 *Assume the conditions of Shalizi. Let $\mathcal{M}^{(3)}$ denote Storey's multiple testing procedure, and let $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{d}_i}$ be the desired level of significance. Then under conditions (C1)–(C5) and condition (B2) of Theorem 20, there exists a sequence $\lambda_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that, for any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$pBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(3)}\right) \to \alpha, \text{ as } n \to \infty; \tag{5.81}$$

$$pBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(3)}\right) = O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right), \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{5.82}$$

5.4 A Bayesian modification of Storey's multiple testing method and the related asymptotics

The asymptotic results on Storey's method requires assumptions (C1)–(C5), which imply that the f_i and g_i are normal densities. A Bayesian modification of Storey's procedure offers far broader scope in this respect.

We define

$$S_B(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\sum_{i=k_0+1}^{m} \pi(H_{1i}|\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{i=1}^{k_0} \pi(H_{0i}|\mathbf{x})}, \tag{5.83}$$

and propose to reject H_{0i} if $S_B(\mathbf{x}_{in}) > \lambda$ for some $\lambda \in [0, \infty)$.

Suppose that $\mathbf{x}_n \sim f_\ell(\cdot|\theta_{0\ell})$ for some $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Then by Shalizi's result, almost surely, as $n \to \infty$, $\pi(H_{0\ell}|\mathbf{x}_n) \to 1$, $\pi(H_{0i}|\mathbf{x}_n) \to 0$ for $i \neq \ell$ and $\pi(H_{1i}|\mathbf{x}_n) \to 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Similarly, if $\mathbf{x}_n \sim g_\ell(\cdot|\theta_{1\ell})$ for some $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, then almost surely, as $n \to \infty$, $\pi(H_{1\ell}|\mathbf{x}_n) \to 1$, $\pi(H_{1i}|\mathbf{x}_n) \to 0$ for $i \neq \ell$ and $\pi(H_{0i}|\mathbf{x}_n) \to 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. It follows that

$$S_B(\mathbf{x}_{in}) \begin{cases} \to \infty & \text{almost surely as } n \to \infty, \text{ if } \mathbf{x}_{in} \sim g_i(\cdot|\theta_{1i}); \\ \to 0 & \text{almost surely as } n \to \infty, \text{ if } \mathbf{x}_{in} \sim f_i(\cdot|\theta_{0i}). \end{cases} \tag{5.84}$$

In other words, as $n \to \infty$, $\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{d}^t$ holds, almost surely. Formally, we have the following result, denoting the Bayesian modification of Storey's method by $\mathcal{M}^{(4)}$..

Lemma 34 *Let λ_n be a sequence of thresholds associated with Storey's method satisfying $\liminf_{n\geq 1} \lambda_n > 0$ and $\limsup_{n\geq 1} \lambda_n < \infty$. Then, under the assumption that Shalizi's conditions holds, $\mathcal{M}^{(4)}$ is consistent.*

The following theorems hold under Shalizi's assumptions, completely relaxing conditions (C1)–(C5).

Theorem 35 *Let $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{d}_i}$ be the desired level of significance. Then under Shalizi's assumptions and conditions (B1) and (B2) of Theorem 20), there exists a sequence $\lambda_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that*

$$mpBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(3)}\right) \to \alpha, \text{ as } n \to \infty; \tag{5.85}$$

$$mpBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(3)}\right) = O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right), \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{5.86}$$

Theorem 36 *Let* $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{d}_i}$ *be the desired level of significance. Then under Shalizi's assumptions and condition (B2) of Theorem 20), there exists a sequence* $\lambda_n \to 0$ *as* $n \to \infty$ *such that*

$$pBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(3)}\right) \to \alpha, \text{ as } n \to \infty; \tag{5.87}$$

$$pBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(3)}\right) = O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right), \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{5.88}$$

5.5 Summary of the asymptotic results related to category (a)

As representatives of category (a) we have selected the non-marginal multiple testing method of Chandra and Bhattachary (2016), the method of Guindani *et al.* (2009), the method of Storey (2007) and its Bayesian modification, and have shown that for all consistent methods falling in this category, the asymptotic results on $mpBFDR$, $pBFDR$, $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$, are the same.

For α-control, $mpBFDR$ requires the mild, but still extra assumption of existence of a single hypothesis where the null is true, and that this hypothesis does not intersect the other groups of hypotheses. Importantly, as we have shown, for large sample sizes, α can not take any value in $(0, 1)$; it must be bounded above by $\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{d}_i\right)^{-1}$. Hence, for large samples, the practitioner must choose α carefully. As regards $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$, we have shown that, with or without α-control of $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$, both $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$ converge to zero at the same rate. Thus, the usual expectation of statisticians that controlling FDR is expected to yield smaller FNR does not hold in the asymptotic scenario.

6 Asymptotics of category (b) with asymptotically α-controlled versions of $BFDR$

In this category, we consider the methods of Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) and Sarkar *et al.* (2008) as representatives.

6.1 Asymptotics of the method of Sarkar *et al.* (2008)

6.1.1 The main idea

For $k = 0, \ldots, m$, let

$$\bar{q}_k\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} \pi\left(H_{0i}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)}{k}, \tag{6.1}$$

with $\bar{q}_0\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = 0$. Here we assume, without loss of generality, that

$$\pi\left(H_{01}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) \leq \pi\left(H_{02}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) \leq \cdots \leq \pi\left(H_{0m}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right).$$

For $0 < \alpha < 1$, let

$$R(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = \max\left\{0 \leq j \leq m : \bar{q}_j\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) \leq \alpha\right\}. \tag{6.2}$$

Given $R(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = k$, Sarkar *et al.* (2008) consider the following one-step randomized multiple-testing procedure:

$$\delta_i\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad i \leq k; \\ \frac{\alpha - \bar{q}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_n)}{\bar{q}_{k+1}(\boldsymbol{X}_n) - \bar{q}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_n)} & \text{if} \quad i = k+1; \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad i > k+1, \end{cases} \tag{6.3}$$

with $\delta_i(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ if $k = m$.

Sarkar *et al.* (2008) show that their procedure (6.3), which we denote by $\mathcal{M}^{(5)}$ controls $BFDR$ in the sense that $BFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}\right) \leq \alpha$. Specifically, Sarkar *et al.* (2008) show that

$$\begin{aligned} BFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}\right) &= E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left\{(1-\delta_{k+1}(\boldsymbol{X}_n))\bar{q}_k\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) + \delta_{k+1}(\boldsymbol{X}_n)\bar{q}_{k+1}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right\} I\left(R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)=k\right) \\ &\quad + E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left\{\bar{q}_m\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) I\left(R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)=k\right)\right\} \\ &= \alpha P\left(0 \leq R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) < m\right) + E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left\{\bar{q}_m(\boldsymbol{X}_n) I\left(R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)=m\right)\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

If α is replaced with a sequence α_n such that $\alpha_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, then $BFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$.

6.1.2 Consistency of $\mathcal{M}^{(5)}$ in the case of true alternatives

First note that if $\boldsymbol{d}^t \neq \mathbf{0}$, then $d_j^t = 1$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Then, by Shalizi's theorem, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\exp\left[-n(J(H_{0j}) + \epsilon)\right] < \pi(H_{0j}|\boldsymbol{X}_n) < \exp\left[-n(J(H_{0j}) - \epsilon)\right], \tag{6.5}$$

almost surely, for those indices j. It follows that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^{i} \exp\left[-n(J(H_{0\ell}) + \epsilon)\right]}{i} < \bar{q}_i(\boldsymbol{X}_n) < \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^{i} \exp\left[-n(J(H_{0\ell}) - \epsilon)\right]}{i}, \text{ for } i \leq j. \tag{6.6}$$

Now, if $R(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = k$, then by definition of $R(\boldsymbol{X}_n)$, $j \leq k$, since almost surely, $\bar{q}_j(\boldsymbol{X}_n) \to 0$ ($\leq \alpha$). Hence, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\delta_j\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = 1 \text{ almost surely, whenever } d_j^t = 1, \tag{6.7}$$

showing that consistency attains in the case of true alternatives. We formally state the result as follows.

Lemma 37 *Assume the conditions of Shalizi. Then for all $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $\mathcal{M}^{(5)}$ is consistent in the case of true alternatives.*

6.1.3 Non-asymptotic and asymptotic treatments of versions of $BFDR$ for $\mathcal{M}^{(5)}$

It follows from (1.7) that

$$\delta(\boldsymbol{d} = \mathbf{0}|\boldsymbol{X}_n) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \left(1 - \delta_i(\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right). \tag{6.8}$$

Hence, $\delta(\boldsymbol{d} = \mathbf{0}|\boldsymbol{X}_n) = 0$ if and only if $\delta_i(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = 1$ for at least one $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Since at least $d_j^t = 1$, it follows from (6.7) that almost surely $\delta_j\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = 1$, for $n \geq n_0$. Hence, by (6.8), $\delta(\boldsymbol{d} = \mathbf{0}|\boldsymbol{X}_n) = 0$ almost surely, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$. That is, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$P\left(\delta\left(\boldsymbol{d} = \mathbf{0}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = 0\right) = 1. \tag{6.9}$$

Now note that by definition (6.3), $\boldsymbol{d} \neq \mathbf{0}$. Then it follows that for fixed α,

$$E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}\neq\mathbf{0}} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i}\right) \delta\left(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right] = BFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}), \tag{6.10}$$

where $BFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)})$ is given by (6.4). Hence, it follows from (6.9) that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$pBFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) = BFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}). \tag{6.11}$$

We now compare $pBFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)})$ with $mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)})$, for fixed α. Note that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, letting

$$\bar{w}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k}(1 - w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}))}{k}, \tag{6.12}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
mpBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}\right) &= E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left\{(1 - \delta_{k+1}(\boldsymbol{X}_n))\bar{w}_k\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) + \delta_{k+1}(\boldsymbol{X}_n)\bar{w}_{k+1}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right\} I\left(R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = k\right) \\
&\quad + E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left\{\bar{w}_n\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) I\left(R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = k\right)\right\} \\
&\geq E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left\{(1 - \delta_{k+1}(\boldsymbol{X}_n))\bar{q}_k\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) + \delta_{k+1}(\boldsymbol{X}_n)\bar{q}_{k+1}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right\} I\left(R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = k\right) \\
&\quad + E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left\{\bar{w}_n\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) I\left(R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = k\right)\right\} \\
&\geq \alpha P\left(0 \leq R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) < m\right) + E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left\{\bar{q}_n(\boldsymbol{X}_n) I\left(R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = k\right)\right\} \\
&= BFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

The above derivations only show that $BFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) \leq \alpha$, $pBFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) \leq \alpha$ and $mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) \geq BFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)})$. We now show that the exact level α is achievable by all the three criteria as $n \to \infty$.

Let $d_i^t = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$ and $d_i^t = 0$ for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$. Then, for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, it holds almost surely that,

$$\exp\left[-n(J(H_{1j}) + \epsilon)\right] < v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) < \exp\left[-n(J(H_{1j}) - \epsilon)\right]. \tag{6.14}$$

Let

$$0 < \alpha \leq \frac{m - 1 - k_0}{m - 1}. \tag{6.15}$$

Then it follows that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, the following holds:

$$R(\boldsymbol{X}_n) < m, \text{ with probability } 1. \tag{6.16}$$

Hence, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, $P\left(0 \leq R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) < m\right) = 1$ and $I\left(R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = m\right) = 0$ almost surely. From (6.4) it then follows that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$BFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}\right) = \alpha \tag{6.17}$$

$$pBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}\right) = \alpha \tag{6.18}$$

For $mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)})$, we assume conditions (A1) and (A2) of Theorem 15. In that case, for $i = 1, \ldots, m$, $w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) = v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})$, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$. Hence, under (A1) and (A2),

$$mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) = pBFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) = BFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) = \alpha, \text{ for } n \geq n_0(\epsilon). \tag{6.19}$$

Formally, we have the following result.

Theorem 38 *Assume without loss of generality that $\pi\left(H_{01}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) \leq \pi\left(H_{02}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) \leq \cdots \leq \pi\left(H_{0m}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)$, and that $d_i^t = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$; $d_i^t = 0$ for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$. Further assume that α satisfies (6.15). Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, under Shalizi's conditions, there exists $n_0(\epsilon) \geq 1$ such that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, $pBFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) = BFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) = \alpha$. If, in addition, conditions (A1) and (A2) of Theorem 15 hold, then $mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) = \alpha$ is also ensured.*

6.1.4 Asymptotic forms of versions of $BFNR$ for $\mathcal{M}^{(5)}$

We now compare $pBFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)})$ and $mpBFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)})$ for fixed α, showing that $BFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)})$ has the same asymptotic form as its positive version. Indeed, for randomized procedures it is less obvious compared to other procedures that the asymptotic forms of the different Bayesian versions of the error measures are the same. For our purpose, we first show that $\delta_j(\boldsymbol{X}_n)$ given by (6.3) is consistent if $d_j^t = 0$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$.

Since $\boldsymbol{d}^t \neq \mathbf{1}$, let $d_j^t = 0$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Then, by Shalizi's result, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\exp\left[-n(J(H_{1j}) + \epsilon)\right] < v_{jn}(\boldsymbol{d}^t) < \exp\left[-n(J(H_{1j}) - \epsilon)\right],$$

so that

$$1 - \exp\left[-n(J(H_{1j}) - \epsilon)\right] < \pi(H_{0j}|\boldsymbol{X}_n) < 1 - \exp\left[-n(J(H_{1j}) + \epsilon)\right].$$

almost surely, for index j. Let, without loss of generality, $\pi(H_{01}|\boldsymbol{X}_n) \leq \pi(H_{02}|\boldsymbol{X}_n) \leq \cdots \leq \pi(H_{0m}|\boldsymbol{X}_n)$; $d_i^t = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$ and $d_i^t = 0$ for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$. Also let $0 < \alpha \leq \eta$, where

$$\eta = \sup_{n \geq n_0(\epsilon)} \min_{j=1,\ldots,m} v_{jn}(\boldsymbol{d}^t). \tag{6.20}$$

Then, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, $R(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = k$ almost surely, where $k \leq k_0$. In particular, if $\alpha = \eta$, then $R(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = k_0$ almost surely. Also, $\alpha - \bar{q}_{k_0}(\boldsymbol{X}_n) < \epsilon$, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$. Hence, $\delta_j(\boldsymbol{X}_n) \to 0$, almost surely as $n \to \infty$, for $j \geq k_0 + 1$. In other words, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 39 *Assume the conditions of Shalizi. Then for $\alpha = \eta$, where η is given by (6.20), $\mathcal{M}^{(5)}$ is consistent in the case of true null hypotheses.*

Hence,

$$\delta(\boldsymbol{d} = \mathbf{1}|\boldsymbol{X}_n) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \delta_i(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = 0, \tag{6.21}$$

almost surely, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$. That is, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$P\left(\delta\left(\boldsymbol{d} = \mathbf{1}|\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = 0\right) = 1. \tag{6.22}$$

Hence, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$pBFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) = BFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}). \tag{6.23}$$

Formally, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 40 *Assume the conditions of Shalizi. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0(\epsilon) \geq 1$ such that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, (6.23) holds when $\alpha = \eta$.*

We now investigate the asymptotic forms of $pBFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)})$ and $mpBFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)})$. Let $d_i^t = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$ and $d_i^t = 0$ for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$, where $k_0 > 1$. Then, as shown above, for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$ and $\alpha = \eta$, $R(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = k_0$ almost surely. Hence, almost surely, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, we have

$$pBFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) = E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\frac{\sum_{i=k_0+1}^{m} v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^{(1)})}{m - k_0}(1 - \delta_{k_0+1}(\boldsymbol{X}_n)) + \frac{\sum_{i=k_0+2}^{m} v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^{(2)})}{m - k_0 - 1}\delta_{k_0+1}(\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right]; \tag{6.24}$$

$$mpBFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) = E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left[\frac{\sum_{i=k_0+1}^{m} w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^{(1)})}{m - k_0}(1 - \delta_{k_0+1}(\boldsymbol{X}_n)) + \frac{\sum_{i=k_0+2}^{m} w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^{(2)})}{m - k_0 - 1}\delta_{k_0+1}(\boldsymbol{X}_n)\right]. \tag{6.25}$$

where $d_i^{(1)} = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$ and $d_i^{(1)} = 0$ for $i = k_0+1, \ldots, m$; also $d_i^{(2)} = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0+1$ and $d_i^{(1)} = 0$ for $i = k_0 + 2, \ldots, m$.

Then it follows from (6.14) that

$$pBFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) = O(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)). \tag{6.26}$$

For the asymptotic form of $mpBFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)})$ observe that for $i \geq k_0 + 1$, $w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^{(1)}) = O(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon))$ and $w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^{(2)}) = O(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon))$ for $i \geq k_0 + 2$. Hence,

$$mpBFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) = O(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)). \tag{6.27}$$

The above arguments and results lead to the following theorem.

Theorem 41 *Assume the conditions of Shalizi. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0(\epsilon) \geq 1$ such that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, (6.26) and (6.27) hold when $\alpha = \eta$.*

Since $w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) \leq v_{in}(\boldsymbol{d})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$, it follows from (6.24) and (6.25) that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, $mpBFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)}) \leq pBFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)})$. However, it follows from (6.26) and (6.27) that $mpBFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)})$ converges to zero at the same rate as $pBFNR(\mathcal{M}^{(5)})$. In fact, since for all $mpBFNR(\mathcal{M})$ and $pBFNR(\mathcal{M})$ have the same asymptotic form for all $\mathcal{M}$ falling in category (a), it follows that $\mathcal{M} \equiv \mathcal{M}^{(5)}$ for all $\mathcal{M}$ falling in category (a).

We now obtain the asymptotic forms of $BFDR$, $pBFDR$ and $mpBFDR$ for the Benjamini and Hochberg (BH) procedure (Benjamini and Hochberg (1995)).

6.2 Asymptotics of the BH procedure

6.2.1 The key idea of the BH method

The BH procedure is given as follows. Let $P_{1n}^{(0)} \leq P_{2n}^{(0)} \leq \cdots P_{mn}^{(0)}$ be the ordered observed P-values associated with the m (ordered) hypotheses. For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, let

$$R(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = \max\left\{i : P_{in}^{(0)} \leq \frac{i}{m}\alpha\right\}. \tag{6.28}$$

Given $R(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = k$, the BH procedure rejects $H_{0i}; i \leq k$.

6.2.2 Consistency of the BH procedure

As before, let $d_i^t = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$ and $d_i^t = 0$ for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$. We assume that for $i = 1, \ldots, m$, $P_{in}^{(0)} = P_{H_{0i}}\left(T(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_{in}) > T(\boldsymbol{X}_{in})\right)$, where T is a relevant statistic for the testing purpose and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_{in}$ is the random variable associated with the null distribution such that as $n \to \infty$, $T(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_{in}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \theta_{0i}$, where $\theta_{0i} \in \text{int}(\Theta_{0i})$. Here, for any set A, int(A) denotes the interior of A. Let $\theta_i^{(0)}$ denote the true value of θ_i generating the data $\boldsymbol{X}_{in}$. If $\theta_i^{(0)} \in \text{int}(\Theta_{0i})$, then $T(\boldsymbol{X}_{in}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \theta_i^{(0)}$, and we assume that $P_{in}^{(0)} \to c_i$, for some $0 < c_i < 1$. We further assume that if $\theta_i^{(0)} \in \text{int}(\Theta_{1i})$, then $P_{in}^{(0)} \to 0$.

Let, for $i : \theta_i^{(0)} \in \text{int}(\Theta_{0i})$, $\frac{i}{m}\alpha < c_i$, that is,

$$0 < \alpha < \min_{i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}} \frac{mc_i}{i}. \tag{6.29}$$

Then, since $d_i^t = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$ and $d_i^t = 0$ for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$, it follows that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, $P_{in}^{(0)} < \epsilon$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$ and $P_{in}^{(0)} > \frac{i}{m}\alpha$ for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$. Hence, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, $d_i = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$ and $d_i = 0$ for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$, almost surely. In other words, for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, $\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{d}^t$, almost surely. In other words, we have the following formal result on consistency of the BH method.

Lemma 42 *With the above set-up and assumptions with α given by (6.29), the BH procedure is consistent.*

Hence, by Theorem 6, under Shalizi's assumptions, $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$ for BH have the asymptotic forms (3.7) and (3.19), respectively. Also, by Theorem 16, $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$ of BH have the asymptotic forms (4.3) and (4.4), respectively, assuming that Shalizi's conditions hold.

The above results show that for BH, the versions of $BFDR$ and $BFNR$ tend to zero as sample size increases. In order to achieve asymptotic α-control for the versions of $BFDR$ in the next section we devise a randomized method synthesizing the ideas of Sarkar *et al.* (2008) and the BH procedure.

6.3 A randomized BH procedure

For $0 < \alpha < 1$, let

$$R(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = \max\left\{0 \le j \le m : \bar{P}_{jn}^{(0)}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) \le \alpha\right\}, \tag{6.30}$$

where $\bar{P}_{jn}^{(0)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{j} P_{in}^{(0)}}{j}$. Given $R(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = k$, we consider the following one-step randomized multiple-testing procedure analogous to that of Sarkar *et al.* (2008):

$$\delta_i\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad i \le k; \\ \frac{\alpha - \bar{P}_{kn}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{X}_n)}{\bar{P}_{k+1,n}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{X}_n) - \bar{P}_{kn}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{X}_n)} & \text{if} \quad i = k+1; \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad i > k+1, \end{cases} \tag{6.31}$$

with $\delta_i(\boldsymbol{X}_n) = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ if $k = m$. In the same way as (6.4) it then holds that

$$\begin{aligned} BFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(6)}\right) &= E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left\{(1 - \delta_{k+1}(\boldsymbol{X}_n))\bar{P}_{kn}^{(0)}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) + \delta_{k+1}(\boldsymbol{X}_n)\bar{P}_{k+1,n}^{(0)}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right)\right\} I\left(R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = k\right) \\ &\quad + E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left\{\bar{P}_{mn}^{(0)}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) I\left(R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = k\right)\right\} \\ &= \alpha P\left(0 \le R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) < m\right) + E_{\boldsymbol{X}_n}\left\{\bar{P}_{mn}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{X}_n) I\left(R\left(\boldsymbol{X}_n\right) = m\right)\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.32}$$

where $\mathcal{M}^{(6)}$ stands for the BH method. As before, let $d_i^t = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$ and $d_i^t = 0$ for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$. We also assume as before, that for $i = 1, \ldots, m$, $P_{in}^{(0)} = P_{H_{0i}}\left(T(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_{in}) > T(\boldsymbol{X}_{in})\right)$, where $T(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_{in}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \theta_{0i}$, where $\theta_{0i} \in \text{int}(\Theta_{0i})$ and that $\alpha = \eta$ where η is given by (6.20). We then have the following theorem.

Theorem 43 *Assume the above conditions with α is given by (6.15). Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0(\epsilon) \ge 1$ such that for $n \ge n_0(\epsilon)$, the following hold almost surely:*

$$BFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(6)}\right) = \alpha \tag{6.33}$$

$$pBFDR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(6)}\right) = \alpha, \tag{6.34}$$

and under conditions (A1) and (A2) of Theorem 15,

$$mpBFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(6)}) = pBFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(6)}) = BFDR(\mathcal{M}^{(6)}) = \alpha, \text{ for } n \ge n_0(\epsilon). \tag{6.35}$$

The following results hold as before.

Theorem 44 *Under the conditions of Shalizi, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0(\epsilon) \ge 1$ such that for*

$n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$, *and for* $\alpha = \eta$, *where* η *is given by (6.20).*

$$BFNR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(6)}\right) = O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right); \tag{6.36}$$

$$pBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(6)}\right) = O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right); \tag{6.37}$$

$$mpBFNR\left(\mathcal{M}^{(6)}\right) = O\left(\gamma_n^t(\epsilon)\right). \tag{6.38}$$

6.4 Summary and discussion of the results related to category (b)

We have chosen the BH procedure and the randomized procedure of Sarkar *et al.* (2008) as representatives of this category. We have shown that for the method of Sarkar *et al.* (2008), the relevant versions of $BFDR$ asymptotically attain α, where α is given by (6.15), whereas for BH, the versions of $BFDR$ tend to zero, as sample size tends to infinity. To remedy the issue of BH, we have proposed a randomized version of the BH method, and have shown that the purpose is achieved by the randomized version. For asymptotics related to versions of $BFNR$, however, the permissible range of α is given by (6.20), for both the randomized procedures.

An important difference between the methods of categories (a) and (b) is that, for the former, α must be bounded above by $\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{d}_i\right)^{-1}$, and this bound suffices for the asymptotic theories of versions of $BFDR$ as well as for versions of $BFNR$. However, as noted above, asymptotically permissible ranges of α are different for versions of $BFDR$ and $BFNR$ for the randomized methods of category (b). But, in spite of this significant difference, the versions of $BFNR$ converge to zero at the same rate, irrespective of categories (a) and (b).

7 Asymptotic results with respect to category (c)

Recall that we consider the step-down approach of Chen and Sarkar (2004) as the representative of this category. Below we provide a brief overview of this approach.

7.1 The basic approach of Chen and Sarkar (2004)

Chen and Sarkar (2004) consider datasets of the form $\boldsymbol{X}_n = \{\mathbf{x}_{1n_1}, \mathbf{x}_{2n_2}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{mn_m}\}$, where for $i = 1, \ldots, m$, $\mathbf{x}_{in_i}$ are n_i-dimensional, and are independent of each other. They further assume that $\mathbf{x}_{in_i}$ has density of the form

$$f(\mathbf{x}_{in_i}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i) = \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} f(x_{ij}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i). \tag{7.1}$$

The multiple testing problem here is concerned with testing $H_{0i} : \boldsymbol{\theta}_i \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}_i$ versus $H_{1i} : \boldsymbol{\theta}_i \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}_i^c$. To proceed, Chen and Sarkar (2004) first compute the Bayes factors associated with the hypotheses, with the i-th Bayes factor given by

$$B_i = \frac{\pi(H_{0i}|\mathbf{x}_{in_i})}{\pi(H_{1i}|\mathbf{x}_{in_i})} \times \frac{\pi(H_{1i})}{\pi(H_{0i})}, \tag{7.2}$$

where $\pi(H_{0i}) = \int_{\Theta_{0i}} \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $\pi(H_{1i}) = 1 - \pi(H_{0i})$, $\pi(H_{0i}|\mathbf{x}_{in_i}) = \int_{H_{1i}} \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{x}_{in_i})$ and $\pi(H_{1i}|\mathbf{x}_{in_i}) = 1 - \pi(H_{0i}|\mathbf{x}_{in_i})$.

Chen and Sarkar (2004) order the Bayes factors $\{B_i : i = 1, \ldots, m\}$ in ascending order as $B_{(1)} \leq \cdots \leq B_{(m)}$ and consider the corresponding ordered null hypotheses $H_{0(1)} \leq \cdots \leq H_{0(m)}$. For the stepwise search for the most plausible family of true and false nulls, Chen and Sarkar (2004) define $H^{(0)} = \cap_{i=1}^m H_{0(i)}$ and for $r = 1, \ldots, m$,

$$H^{(r)} = \cap_{i=1}^r H_{1(i)} \cap_{i=r+1}^m H_{0(i)}. \tag{7.3}$$

The stepwise Bayes factor of $H^{(r)}$ to any of $H^{(r+1)}, \ldots, H^{(m)}$ is defined by Chen and Sarkar (2004) as

$$B^{(r)} = \frac{\pi(H^{(r)}|\boldsymbol{X}_n)}{\sum_{i=r+1}^{m} \pi(H^{(i)}|\boldsymbol{X}_n)} \times \frac{\sum_{i=r+1}^{m} \pi(H^{(i)})}{\pi(H^{(r)})}, \tag{7.4}$$

where $\pi(H^{(r)})$ is the prior probability of $H^{(r)}$; $r = 0, 1 \ldots, k-1$. Chen and Sarkar (2004) propose the following Bayesian step-down procedure for selecting the most plausible target family:

(i) (a) Calculate $B^{(0)}$.

(b) If $B^{(0)} > 1$, then accept $H^{(0)} = \cap_{i=1}^{m} H_{0(i)}$ and stop. Otherwise reject $H_{0(1)}$ and go to the next step.

(ii) For $r = 1, \ldots, m-2$,

(a) Calculate $B^{(r)}$.

(b) If $B^{(r)} > 1$, then accept $H^{(r)}$ and stop. Otherwise, reject all $H_{0(i)}$ for $i \leq r+1$ and go to the next step.

(iii) (a) Calculate $B^{(m-1)}$.

(b) If $B^{(m-1)} > 1$, then accept $H^{(m-1)}$ and stop. Otherwise, reject all $H_{0(i)}$ for $i \leq m$.

7.2 Consistency of the step-down procedure

Although Chen and Sarkar (2004) assumed the iid situation, that is not required for asymptotics, and here we only adopt the assumptions of Shalizi, which also applies to dependent situations. For convenience we set $n_i = n$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ and re-write the data as $\boldsymbol{X}_n = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$, where, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $\mathbf{x}_i = \{x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{im}\}$. Then applying Shalizi's result to the posterior probabilities in the numerator and denominator of the ordered versions $B_{(i)}$ of (7.2) it is easily seen that $B_{(i)}$ tends to 0 for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$ and tends to ∞ for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$, for some $k_0 \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. It then follows that $d_i^t = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k_0$ and $d_i^t = 0$ for $i = k_0 + 1, \ldots, m$. Applying Shalizi's result to the posterior probabilities in the numerator and denominator of $B^{(r)}$ given by (7.4), it is easily seen that $\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{d}^t$ almost surely, as $n \to \infty$. The formal consistency result is given as follows.

Lemma 45 *Assume the conditions of Shalizi. Then the step-down procedure of Chen and Sarkar (2004) is consistent.*

Hence, assumption of Shalizi's conditions ensure, through Theorem 6, that $mpBFDR$ and $pBFDR$ for Chen and Sarkar (2004) have the asymptotic forms (3.7) and (3.19), respectively, while Theorem 16 guarantees that the corresponding $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$ have the asymptotic forms (4.3) and (4.4), respectively, under Shalizi's conditions. However, α-control of versions of $BFDR$ is not possible for methods of this category.

7.3 Summary of the results of category (c)

Although we proved the results in this section for the step-down method of Chen and Sarkar (2004), it is easy to see that our results hold for general step-up and step-down procedures. The main difference of the results with respect to categories (a) and (b) is that here α-control can not be exercised. However, the versions of $BFNR$ converge to zero at the same rate as that of the other categories.

8 An asymptotic appraisal of the decision configuration obtained from the non-margnal method for small sample size and comparison with the existing methods

For relatively small sample size n, it is difficult to address how close to $\boldsymbol{d}^t$ the decision configuration $\boldsymbol{d}^M$ obtained by maximizing $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i\,(w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_n)$ is. Here we propose a method of evaluating the reliability of $\boldsymbol{d}^M$ by combining this small-sample based $\boldsymbol{d}^M$ with asymptotic theory, assuming $\boldsymbol{d}^M \neq \boldsymbol{d}^t$. Given output $\boldsymbol{d}^M$, one may assess its reliability with respect to $\boldsymbol{d}^t$ by considering the large sample extension of $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^M \left(w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^M) - \beta_n\right)$, and assessing the performance of $\boldsymbol{d}^M$ retrospectively. However, β_n is not to be associated with asymptotic theory and must depend only on the finite sample $\boldsymbol{X}_n$. However, as will be seen subsequently, it will depend on the asymptotics with respect to the number of hypotheses m, so that, to avoid any confusion, we replace β_n with β_m. Thus, the idea is to view both $\boldsymbol{d}^M$ and $\boldsymbol{d}^t$ through the optimizing function $f_n(\boldsymbol{d}) = \sum_{i=1}^m d_i\,(w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \beta_m)$, after retrospectively extending the available small dataset to a large enough sample.

8.1 Retrospective idea with respect to a single group of hypotheses

Let $\boldsymbol{G} = \{G_1, \ldots, G_m\}$ denote any set of groups associated with the m hypotheses. We first consider the case where $G_i = \{1, \ldots, m\}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Then observe (see also Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016)) that $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^M \left(w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^M) - \beta_m\right) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^M\right) \left(w(\boldsymbol{d}^M) - \beta\right)$, where $w(\boldsymbol{d}^M) = \pi\left(\cap_{i=1}^m H_{d_i^M,i} | \text{Data}\right)$. Since we assume that $\boldsymbol{d}^M \neq \boldsymbol{d}^t$, it holds by Shalizi's theorem, that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\exp\left\{-n\left(J\left(\cap_{i=1}^m H_{d_i^M,i}\right) + \epsilon\right)\right\} < w(\boldsymbol{d}^M) < \exp\left\{-n\left(J\left(\cap_{i=1}^m H_{d_i^M,i}\right) - \epsilon\right)\right\}. \tag{8.1}$$

Hence, the maximizer $\boldsymbol{d}^M$ of $f_n(\boldsymbol{d})$ minimizes the KL-divergence $J\left(\cap_{i=1}^m H_{d_i,i}\right)$ between $\boldsymbol{d}$ and $\boldsymbol{d}^t$, retrospectively, when $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^M$ is held constant. Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016) prove, in the context of the proof of their Theorem 3.3, that $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^M$ is decreasing in β_m for their non-marginal multiple testing procedure. Hence, for any other decision configuration $\boldsymbol{d}^*$ corresponding to any other multiple testing method, there exists $\hat{\beta}_m$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^M = \sum_{i=1}^n d_i^*$, and hence for $\beta_m = \hat{\beta}_m$, $\boldsymbol{d}^M$ is better than $\boldsymbol{d}^*$ in the sense of minimizing the KL-divergence from the true decision configuration.

In other words, when $G_i = \{1, \ldots, m\}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, m$, our non-marginal method is optimal among all multiple testing methods in the sense of minimizing the KL-divergence from the true decision configuration. We formalize this in the form of the following theorem.

Theorem 46 *For any given multiple testing method other than our non-marginal method, let $\boldsymbol{d}^*$ $(\neq \boldsymbol{d}^t)$ denote its decision output associated with any given data set with (perhaps, small) size n. Let $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^* = k$. Assume that for our non-marginal method, $G_i = \{1, \ldots, m\}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Also assume Shalizi's conditions. Then for the same data set there exists $\hat{\beta}$ such that the corresponding decision output $\boldsymbol{d}^M$ retrospectively achieves the minimum KL-divergence $J\left(\cap_{i=1}^m H_{d_i^M,i}\right)$ among all decisions $\boldsymbol{d}$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i = k$.*

8.2 Retrospective idea with respect to a multiple groups of hypotheses

We now consider the case where $\boldsymbol{G} = \{G_1, \ldots, G_m\}$ but $G_i \neq \{1, \ldots, m\}$ for any $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Let $\{G_1^*, \ldots, G_s^*\}$ denote the set of distinct and disjoint groups, where $1 < s \leq m$. For $i = 1, \ldots, s$, let $m_i = |G_i^*|$, the cardinality of the i-th distinct group. Then $\sum_{i=1}^s m_i = m$.

We assume that the hypotheses within the groups G_i^*; $i = 1, \ldots, s$ correspond to parameter sets Θ_i^*; $i = 1, \ldots, s$, and that these parameter sets are *a priori* independent and are associated with independent data sets. In other words, we assume that $\boldsymbol{X}_n = \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1n}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}_{sn}\}$ and the likelihood is of the form $\prod_{i=1}^s [\boldsymbol{X}_{in} | \Theta_i^*]$.

For $\boldsymbol{d}^M$ obtained by our non-marginal method, let $\tilde{m}_i(\boldsymbol{d}^M) = \sum_{j \in G_i^*} d_j^M$ be the number of discoveries associated with the group G_i^*. Let

$$\underline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)} = \min_{i \in \{1,\ldots,s\}} \tilde{m}_i(\boldsymbol{d}^M)$$

and

$$\overline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)} = \max_{i \in \{1,\ldots,s\}} \tilde{m}_i(\boldsymbol{d}^M).$$

Then it easily follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\underline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)}}{m} \pi\left(\cap_{i=1}^m H_{d_i^M,i} | \boldsymbol{X}_n\right) - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^M}{m}\beta_m &\leq \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^M \left(w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^M) - \beta_m\right) = \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{\tilde{m}_i(\boldsymbol{d}^M)}{m}\left(w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^M) - \beta_m\right) \\ &\leq \frac{\overline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)}}{m} \pi\left(\cap_{i=1}^m H_{d_i^M,i} | \boldsymbol{X}_n\right) - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^M}{m}\beta_m. \quad (8.2) \end{aligned}$$

Let $\overline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)} = \underline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)} + C(\boldsymbol{d}^M)$, for some $C(\boldsymbol{d}^M) \geq 0$. Also assume that m, the number of hypotheses, is so large that $C(\boldsymbol{d}^M)/m \approx 0$ but $\underline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)}/m$ is bounded away from zero. Then for any $\boldsymbol{d}^*$ with $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^* = k$ associated with any other multiple testing method, there exists $\beta_m = \hat{\beta}_m$ for which our non-marginal method retrospectively essentially minimizes the KL-divergence from the true decision configuration among all decisions $\boldsymbol{d}$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i = k$.

Formally, we assume that for $i = 1, \ldots, s$, G_i^* corresponds to an infinite-dimensional parameter space Θ_i^*, and that we are interested in testing the hypotheses as m, the number of hypotheses of interest, tends to infinity. We assume that $\beta_m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$, so that $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^M \to \infty$, as $m \to \infty$. We also assume that $\frac{\underline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)}}{m} \to p$, as $m \to \infty$. Since Shalizi's conditions and result also hold for infinite-dimensional parameter spaces, the same arguments with respect to KL-divergence go through even as $m \to \infty$. Indeed, note that in this set-up,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{m\to\infty}\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\underline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)}}{m} \pi\left(\cap_{i=1}^m H_{d_i^M,i} | \boldsymbol{X}_n\right) - \lim_{m\to\infty}\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^M}{m}\beta_m \quad (8.3) \\ &\leq \lim_{m\to\infty}\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m d_i \left(w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^M) - \beta_m\right) = \lim_{m\to\infty}\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{\tilde{m}_i(\boldsymbol{d}^M)}{m}\left(w_{in}(\boldsymbol{d}^M) - \beta_m\right) \\ &\leq \lim_{m\to\infty}\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\overline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)}}{m} \pi\left(\cap_{i=1}^m H_{d_i^M,i} | \boldsymbol{X}_n\right) - \lim_{m\to\infty}\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^M}{m}\beta_m. \quad (8.4) \end{aligned}$$

Let us assume that $\overline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)} = \underline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)} + C_m(\boldsymbol{d}^M)$, where $C_m(\boldsymbol{d}^M)/m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. Then, as $m \to \infty$, $\frac{\underline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)}}{m} \to p$ and $\frac{\overline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)}}{m} \to p$. It also follows that $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^M}{m} \to sp$, as $m \to \infty$, so that $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i^M}{m}\beta_m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. Hence, the lower limit (8.3) and the upper limit (8.4) are the same.

Thus, again we can successfully argue that as $m \to \infty$, our non-marginal method retrospectively minimizes the KL-divergence from the true decision configuration among all decisions $\boldsymbol{d}$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i = \infty$. In this regard, we present the following theorem.

Theorem 47 *Assume the following:*

(i) The number of hypotheses to be tested, m, tends to infinity.

(ii) The hypotheses to be tested are associated with the distinct groups G_i^*; $i = 1, \ldots, s$, which correspond to subspaces of a priori independent infinite-dimensional parameter sets $\{\Theta_1^*, \ldots, \Theta_s^*\}$.

(iii) $\{\Theta_1^*, \ldots, \Theta_s^*\}$ are associated with data $\boldsymbol{X}_n = \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1n}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}_{sn}\}$ such that the likelihood is of the form $\prod_{i=1}^s [\boldsymbol{X}_{in} | \Theta_i^*]$.

(iv) Shalizi's conditions hold.

(v) For (perhaps small) sample size n, the decision configuration $\boldsymbol{d}^* \ (\neq \boldsymbol{d}^t)$ generated by any multiple testing method other than the non-marginal method satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d_i^* = \infty$.

(vi) For the non-marginal procedure, $\beta_m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$, so that $\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i^M \to \infty$ as $m \to \infty$.

(vii) For the decision configuration $\boldsymbol{d}^M$ generated by the non-marginal method, $\frac{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)}{m} \to p$, as $m \to \infty$, for some $p \in (0,1)$.

(viii) $\overline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)} = \underline{\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{d}^M)} + C_m(\boldsymbol{d}^M)$, where $C_m(\boldsymbol{d})^M \geq 0$ for all $m \geq 1$ and satisfies $C_m(\boldsymbol{d}^M)/m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$.

Then for the same data set, for the non-marginal method, the corresponding decision output $\boldsymbol{d}^M$ retrospectively achieves the minimum KL-divergence $J\left(\cap_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{d_i^M,i}\right)$ among all decisions $\boldsymbol{d}$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d_i = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d_i^* = \infty$.

Remark 48 *Conditions (vii) and (viii) are expected to hold even for small samples under the implicit assumption that the sets of "true" hypotheses within parameter spaces Θ_i^*; $i = 1, \ldots, s$, are relatively homogeneous in the sense that there are substantial number of true discoveries in each group G_i^*; $i = 1, \ldots, s$, and that the number of true discoveries do not vary significantly within the groups.*

8.3 The non-marginal decision configuration as retrospective Bayes oracle

We now show that $\boldsymbol{d}^M$ can be retrospectively interpreted as a Bayes oracle in the sense of minimizing the posterior expected loss, with respect to the following loss function, where $f_\theta(\boldsymbol{X}_n)$ denotes the relevant likelihood:

$$\mathcal{K}(\theta, \phi) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} E_\theta \left(\log \frac{f_\theta(\boldsymbol{X}_n)}{f_\phi(\boldsymbol{X}_n)} \right). \tag{8.5}$$

where the expectation E_θ is with respect to $f_\theta(\boldsymbol{X}_n)$. The posterior expected loss is then given by

$$\bar{\mathcal{K}}(\boldsymbol{X}_n, \phi) = E\left[\mathcal{K}(\theta, \phi) | \boldsymbol{X}_n\right], \tag{8.6}$$

so that, given ϕ, $\bar{\mathcal{K}}(\boldsymbol{X}_n, \phi)$ is the expectation of the loss function $\mathcal{K}(\theta, \phi)$ with respect to the posterior of θ given $\boldsymbol{X}_n$. Now, by Shalizi's result, the posterior is consistent in the sense that the posterior concentrates in neighborhoods of the form $\{\theta : -h(\theta) < \epsilon\}$, for any $\epsilon > 0$, where $h(\theta)$ is given by (2.2). Kemperman (1969) showed that half times square of the total variation norm is bounded above by the KL-divergence. Since the total variation norm is stronger than the pointwise difference between distribution functions, Shalizi's result implies weak convergence of the posterior to the true parameter vector $\theta^{(0)}$ when the parameter space is separable (see, for example, Ghosh and Ramamoorthi (2003)). Assuming that $\mathcal{K}(\theta, \phi)$ is bounded and continuous in θ, it then follows using the Portmanteau theorem that

$$\bar{\mathcal{K}}(\boldsymbol{X}_n, \phi) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathcal{K}(\theta^{(0)}, \phi). \tag{8.7}$$

Now observe that the non-marginal decision output $\boldsymbol{d}^M$ is associated with retrospective minimization of $\mathcal{K}\left(\theta^{(0)}, \phi\right)$ with respect to ϕ, proving that it is the retrospective oracle. We present this result formally as follows.

Theorem 49 *Assume the conditions of Theorem 46 or Theorem 47, along with separability of the parameter space. Also assume boundedness and continuity of $\mathcal{K}(\theta, \phi)$ with respect to θ. Then the non-marginal multiple testing procedure retrospectively yields the Bayes oracle when the loss function is given by (8.5).*

Thus, the non-marginal procedure also has the most desirable decision theoretic property.

9 Summary and conclusion

The main objective of this article is to investigate the asymptotic performance of the new, non-marginal, Bayesian multiple testing method of Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016) that takes account of the dependent structure of the hypotheses while making the decisions. To evaluate the performance, we consider the existing Bayesian versions of FDR and FNR, focusing in particular on the positive versions $pBFDR$ and $pBFNR$, in addition to the modifications of the available Bayesian measures proposed by Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016) in light of the dependence structure within the hypotheses.

Under sufficiently general conditions we show that the new positive versions, $mpBFDR$ and $mpBFNR$, have the right kind of asymptotic behaviors in that both converge to zero for the class of all consistent multiple testing methods, which, of course, includes the non-marginal method. Furthermore, the rate of convergence for all consistent methods is the same for $mpBFDR$; the same holds in the case of $pBFDR$. Under additional conditions, $mpBFDR$ is seen to converge to zero at a slower rate than $pBFDR$, but as we point out, the additional conditions ensure that $mpBFDR$ is associated with a smaller KL-divergence from the truth. On the other hand, $mpBFNR$ and $pBFNR$ are seen to have the same rate of convergence to zero, for all consistent multiple testing procedures.

For investigating the asymptotic scenario when $pBFDR$ and $mpBFDR$ are asymptotically controlled at $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we classify the available multiple testing methods into three categories: category (a) includes methods consisting of thresholds where the decisions are obtained by optimizing some sensible criterion subject to controlling some other reasonable criteria; category (b) consists of methods designed to control $pBFDR$ and/or $mpBFDR$ at level α usually by means of ordering criteria such as P-values, and category (c) contains step-up/step-down methods which do not aim towards α-control. With regard to category (a), we propose a new, Bayesian version of the method of Storey, and for category (b), we propose a randomized version of the BH procedure. We show that asymptotically, for category (a), not all values of $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ are available for the controlling purpose; rather α is bounded above by a quantity which may be small when the number of hypotheses is large. The same is applicable to category (b), for appropriately designed methods. It is important to note in this context that for the original BH procedure, $pBFDR$ and $mpBFDR$ converge to zero and does not attain any $\alpha > 0$. Our randomized BH version, however, asymptotically attains α belonging to an appropriate interval of the form $(0, a)$, with $a > 0$. In particular, the asymptotically permissible ranges of α are different for versions of $BFDR$ and $BFNR$ for the randomized multiple testing methods of category (b). For category (c), there is no provision of α-control and we show that $pBFDR$ and $mpBFDR$ converge to zero. As regards $pBFNR$ and $mpBFNR$, they converge to zero at the same rate for all the categories; the rate is also the same as that when α-control is not exercised for the methods.

Our asymptotic results caution the practitioner that any value of $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ can not be used for methods that we considered when moderate to large samples are available. Moreover, for moderate to large samples, there is possibly little value of α-control, since the strategy is not expected to significantly decrease $pBFNR$ and $mpBFNR$, as per our asymptotic theory.

The results summarized above do not single out the non-marginal method as the most advantageous one, with respect to asymptotic theory. However, realizing that it is really important to evaluate a method in light of the available finite sample, we propose a novel retrospective method of assessing the performance of the non-marginal procedure. The method, which conceptually extends the available finite sample to a large enough sample, shows, under appropriate, but practically sensible assumptions, that the non-marginal method is indeed optimal among all available multiple testing methods in the sense that the corresponding decision configuration based on finite sample minimizes the KL-divergence from the true decision configuration. We are also able to show that the non-marginal method retrospectively yields the Bayes oracle with respect to the loss function based on KL-divergence. This property establishes the procedure of Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016) as an optimal decision theoretic multiple testing method.

It is useful to note that even though we generally assumed that the number of hypotheses, m, is fixed (but see Section 8.2 for the exception), all our results continue to hold if $m \to \infty$ under the set-up

assumed in Section 8.2.

Our asymptotic and retrospective results including the result on Bayesian oracle, clearly lead us to recommend the non-marginal method for general multiple testing problems. This recommendation is in accordance with the results of simulation studies and the real data application obtained by Chandra and Bhattacharya (2016).

References

Benjamini, Y. and Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, **57**, 289–300.

Chandra, N. K. and Bhattacharya, S. (2016). A Bayesian Multiple Testing Procedure Based on Non-Marginal Decisions.

Chen, J. and Sarkar, S. K. (2004). Multiple Testing of Response Rates With a Control: A Bayesian Stepwise Approach. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **125**, 3–16.

Ghosh, J. K. and Ramamoorthi, R. V. (2003). *Bayesian Nonparametrics*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Guindani, M., Müller, P., and Zhang, S. (2009). A Bayesian Discovery Procedure. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, **71**, 905–925.

Kemperman, J. H. B. (1969). On the Optimum Rate of Transmitting Information. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **40**, 2156–2177.

Mattner, L. (2000). Minimal Sufficient Statistics for Location-Scale Parameter Models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, **6**, 1121–1134.

Sarkar, S., Zhou, T., and Ghosh, D. (2008). A General Theoretic Formulation of Procedures Controlling FDR and FNR From a Bayesian Perspective. *Statistica Sinica*, **18**, 925–945.

Shalizi, C. R. (2009). Dynamics of Bayesian Updating with Dependent Data and Misspecified Models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, **3**, 1039–1074.

Storey, J. D. (2003). The Positive False Discovery Rate: A Bayesian Interpretation and the q-Value. *The Annals of Statistics*, **31**, 2013–2035.

Storey, J. D. (2007). The Optimal Discovery Procedure: A New Approach to Simultaneous Significance Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, **69**, 347–368.